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Abstract

Leadership research has a long and impressive history in identifying how followers are affected by their leaders’ behaviours. Such research, however, has tended to study one leadership “style” at a time, which does not answer the question of the effects of leader inconsistencies on followers. The study of attitude ambivalence has the potential to meaningfully enhance our understanding of how followers view and react to their leaders. In the current research, I consider how inconsistencies in leaders’ behaviours and attributes influence followers’ attitudes toward their leaders and their own well-being. To do so, I draw on the work stress framework, the attitude literature, implicit leadership theories and empirical evidence. Results across three studies using different methodologies (experimental and survey), different samples (full-time employees and students) and different operationalizations of leader inconsistency (i.e., leader behaviours and leader attributes) provide support for a conditional indirect effect such that leaders’ inconsistent behaviours and attributes predict an array of follower outcomes through the mediating effect of followers’ subjective ambivalence. In Study 3, leader gender moderated the relationship between leaders’ perceived warmth and competence, and followers’ subjective ambivalence, with the impact of leader inconsistencies being more pronounced for female than male leaders. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.
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Chapter 1: Leader (in)consistency and follower attitude ambivalence

Leadership is the most rapidly growing topic in organizational behaviour research (Judge, 2018). One likely cause is the wide-range of consequences stemming from leadership for followers’ work attitudes, performance, and even psychological and physical health (Kelloway, Weigand, McKee, & Das, 2013; Kivimäki et al., 2005; Skakon, Nielsen, Borg, & Guzman, 2010). Leaders, therefore, indirectly impact the success or failure of their organizations (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996). Over time, numerous leadership theories have emerged, which typically focus on either positive or negative leadership behaviours, or “styles”. On the positive side, transformational leadership and leader-member exchange, among other theories, have been studied extensively (Barling, 2014; Bass, 1985; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Abusive supervision and passive leadership represent some of the undesirable and destructive leadership behaviours or styles identified (Kelloway, Sivanathan, Francis, & Barling, 2005, Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007; Tepper, 2000). Although both positive and negative leader behaviours are known to exert strong influences on followers, the complementary or interactive effects of different leadership behaviours are rarely considered (Hannah, Sumanth, Lester, & Cavaretta, 2014). This may reflect an implicit assumption in leadership research—that leaders have one specific and dominant leadership ‘style’ from which they do not deviate. Challenging this assumption is important from a theoretical perspective because leadership theories do not suggest that leaders would adhere to behaviours associated with one style only. For example, the full range leadership theory asserts that leaders will enact different behaviours with varying frequency (Avolio & Bass, 1991; Bass & Avolio, 1994). This theoretical foundation is also supported by empirical studies that confirm that leaders’ behaviours vary across time and
situations (Johnson, Venus, Lanaj, Mao, & Chang, 2012; Lin, Ma, & Johnson, 2016). Thus, there is some recognition that research focused on a single type of leader behaviour or style of leadership may not provide an accurate depiction of how followers experience enacted leadership (Hannah et al., 2014). The current research seeks to contribute to this nascent research by focusing on how followers perceive and are impacted by different combinations of leader behaviours, a phenomenon referred to as inconsistent leadership (Katz-Navon, Kark, & Delegach, 2019; Mullen, Kelloway, & Teed, 2011).

In this research, I posit that leaders are likely to enact behaviours that align with more than one style, and that followers are negatively impacted by their leaders’ inconsistent leadership. I assert that inconsistent leadership may prompt followers to experience evaluative conflict toward their leaders (i.e., attitude ambivalence) which, in turn, negatively influence how followers react to their leaders. Considering the work stress framework (Pratt & Barling, 1988), I propose that inconsistent leader behaviour acts as a stressor which can be negatively appraised by followers as stress (represented by subjective ambivalence - the psychological conflict experienced when leaders are simultaneously evaluated as both positive and negative; Priester & Petty, 1996) and ultimately impact workplace related outcomes (i.e., strain). One overarching question guides this research: Does subjective ambivalence mediate the relationship between leader inconsistencies and follower outcomes? I conducted three studies to examine this proposition.

This research is important for several reasons. First, it challenges the common assumption guiding research – that leaders have a style from which they do not deviate; after all, even the best leaders have bad days. Second, this research responds to the call to consider the interactive effects of different leader behaviours (Hannah et al., 2014; Yukl, 2012). Finally,
ambivalence is considered as a mediating variable in an attempt to explain how inconsistent leader behaviours impact follower outcomes. Identifying the processes that underlie leader-follower relationships (i.e., how leaders’ behaviours influence followers) adds to the progression of leadership research (Barling, 2014). See Figure 1 for the conceptual model.

**Leadership**

Transformational leadership is one of the most frequently studied areas of positive leadership since it was introduced by Burns (1978) and further developed by Bass (1985). Bass’s model of transformational leadership includes four behavioural dimensions: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration. Frequently these dimensions are collapsed into a unidimensional construct (van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013; Tepper et al., 2018), which emphasizes high-quality relationships between leaders and followers (Barling, 2014). When studied together, transformational leadership tends to be strongly correlated with other forms of positive leadership such as ethical leadership ($r = .71$, Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005), authentic leadership ($\rho = .75$, Hoch, Bommer, Dulebohn, & Wu, 2018) and leader member exchange (LMX, $r = .68$, Hughes, Avey, & Nixon, 2010). Previous studies have established that transformational leadership relates to followers’ positive emotions (Bono, Foldes, Vinson, & Muros, 2007), increased performance under stress (Lyons & Schneider, 2009) and well-being (Arnold, Turner, Barling, Kelloway, & McKee, 2007; Kelloway & Barling, 2010). Followers tend to view transformational leadership behaviours as both satisfying and effective (Judge & Picollo, 2004). Early conceptualizations suggested that transformational leadership behaviours would co-occur with transactional behaviours; supporting the idea that leaders would enact different leadership techniques with varying frequency (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994). Indeed, the frequency with which leaders enact transformational
behaviours can fluctuate significantly (Breevaart, Bakker, Demerouti, & Derks, 2016; Michel & LeBreton, 2011; Tims, Bakker, & Xanthopoulou, 2011).

However, studies that focus solely on the impact of positive leader behaviour fail to account for the finding that unpleasant experiences can have more influence than positive events (Baumeister, Bratslavasky, Finanauer, & Vohs, 2001). Thus, a growing body of research has started to consider the frequency and impact of destructive leader behaviours, to which I now turn my attention.

Poor leadership can stem from at least two types of leader behaviours: the display of “abusive, aggressive or punitive” behaviours (Kelloway et al., 2005, p. 91) or the demonstration of an absence of leadership behaviours, also referred to as passive or laissez-faire leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Together, the extent to which these behaviours can contribute to lost productivity that is estimated in the billions of dollars annually (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Abusive supervision is characterized by displays of hostile behaviours (i.e., verbal or non-verbal, but not physical) by supervisors toward their subordinates (Tepper, 2000). Abusive behaviours can vary from yelling and degrading employees to threatening their jobs (Kelloway et al., 2005). In terms of prevalence, an estimated 10-16% of American employees report abusive supervision on a regular basis (Namie & Namie, 2000; Tepper, Duffy, Hoobler, & Ensley, 2004). Among other negative outcomes, employees who perceive their leaders as abusive experience reduced job and life satisfaction as well as more psychological distress (Tepper, 2000; for reviews see Martinko, Harvey, Brees, & Mackey, 2013; Schyns & Schilling, 2013). Overall, abusive supervision is to be a considered destructive and dysfunctional leader behaviour (Krasikova, Green, & LeBreton, 2013).
Passive leadership refers to leader *inaction*, which can occur for a variety of reasons (e.g., leaders do not perceive a problem or lack the appropriate leadership skills to address it; DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011; Kelloway et al., 2005). In general, passive leadership is deemed ineffective because it indicates that leaders have not carried out their basic supervisory duties. However, passive leadership is not typically seen as motivated or intentional (Barling & Frone, 2016; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Kelloway et al., 2005). One type of passive leader behaviour, laissez-faire leadership, has been associated with negative outcomes for followers including increased levels of distress and higher levels of interpersonal conflict with colleagues (Skogstad et al., 2007) as well as reduced satisfaction with the leader and lower ratings of leader effectiveness (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Another approach to understanding passive leadership considers the impact of leaders failing to respond to followers’ performance, which can manifest as either reward or punishment omission (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Reward omission involves leaders failing to reinforce positive follower performance, whereas punishment omission refers to leaders failing to react to poor follower performance. Both reward and punishment omission have been linked to less satisfaction with supervision and reduced role clarity, and reward omission has been associated with lower perceptions of supervisor effectiveness (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008).

Research attention toward both positive leadership and negative supervisory behaviours has been impacted by the prevailing idea that leaders consistently use one specific leadership style. Accordingly, there is extensive evidence demonstrating that *either* positive or negative leadership behaviours exert strong influences on followers. However, examining leadership from only one perspective does not address the evidence that positive and negative leader behaviours co-occur (e.g., Arnold, Connelly, Gellatly, Walsh & Withey, 2017; Barling, Akers & Beiko,
2018; Herr et al., 2019; Lee, Wang & Piccolo, 2018), raising the possibility that the same leader could enact both positive and negative leadership introduces the concept of inconsistent leadership (Katz-Navon et al., 2019; Mullen et al., 2011).

**Inconsistent Leadership**

Mullen et al. (2011) used the term inconsistent leadership to describe the co-occurrence of transformational and passive leadership, but it could also describe the co-occurrence of other types of high- and low-quality leadership behaviours. Indeed, such inconsistencies have been documented in the literature, disconfirming the idea that leaders’ behaviours adhere to only one leadership style. For example, leaders studied over 15 consecutive days displayed a great deal of within-person variation on consideration, transformational and abusive behaviours (Johnson et al., 2012). Similarly, leaders’ displays of ethical behaviour one day were linked to increases in abusive supervision the next day (Lin et al., 2016).

Inconsistency can also occur between other leader behaviours, for example, safety-specific transformational leadership and safety-specific passive leadership (Kelloway, Mullen, & Francis, 2006), and the positive effects of transformational leadership can be impacted by the presence of passive forms of leadership in both safety-specific (Mullen et al., 2011) and non-safety specific contexts (Breevaart & Zacher, 2019). In an experimental study of employed adults, inconsistent leader behaviours (i.e., both transformational leadership and management-by-exception passive behaviours) were perceived as inconsistent and unclear, as were mid-range levels of leadership (e.g., moderate levels of transformational leadership behaviours) in comparison with the high and low transformational leadership conditions.

The co-occurrence of supervisor support and conflict behaviours (e.g., supervisor aggression) is also likely seen as inconsistent (Major, Zubek, Gooper, Gozzarelli, & Richards,
Several studies have documented that supervisors can be perceived as both aggressive (e.g., abusive, undermining, uncivil) and supportive. Across studies, the combination of high- and low-quality leadership behaviours had a detrimental impact on a variety of followers’ outcomes such as physiological and psychological well-being, counterproductive work behaviours and safety participation (e.g., Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002; Herr et al., 2019; Hobman, Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2009; Mullen, Fiset, & Rheaume, 2018; Nahum-Shani, Henderson, Lim, & Vinokur, 2014). Similarly, the presence of abusive supervision within a positive leader-member exchange relationship was associated with followers’ reduced need satisfaction and increased organizational deviance (Lian, Ferris, & Brown, 2012).

It is worthwhile to consider why inconsistent leadership behaviours negatively impact followers. Various leadership theories highlight the centrality of consistency between leadership behaviours and organizational and personal values (Gardner, Avolio, & Walumbwa, 2005; Yukl, 2013). As described previously, when positive leadership behaviours are considered on their own, they produce positive outcomes for followers. A similar, but negative, effect occurs for poor-quality leader behaviours such as abusive supervision and passive leadership. Studying both simultaneously (e.g., the interactive effects) offers the opportunity to identify the contextual variables that strengthen or change the relationship between leader behaviours and outcomes (Muller, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2005). In the workplace, individuals who display large variations in their interpersonal behaviour have more distant social contacts and are avoided by well-acquainted co-workers to a higher extent than individuals whose behaviours are more stable over time and across settings (Côté, Moskowitz, & Zuroff, 2011). Expanding this idea to the leadership context suggests that leader inconsistencies might be threatening to followers if they
produce uncertainty within the relationship and make it difficult to predict and control (Major et al., 1997) future interactions.

Most recently, Katz-Navon et al. (2019) proposed that inconsistent leadership could be interpreted as a “weak” situation. Strong situations (Mischel, 1973) provide individuals with indications of what behaviour is expected in their current context (e.g., the workplace; Meyer, Dalal, & Hermida, 2010). Leadership contributes to individuals’ interpretations of situational strength (Bass, 1999) because leaders provide their followers with cues regarding expectations at work. Thus, leaders contribute to strong situations when they provide both clarity and consistency; in contrast, they engender weak situations when they fail to provide followers with clarity and consistency (Meyer et al., 2010). Leaders offer high levels of clarity when their directions and cues to followers are unambiguous (Meyer et al., 2010; Katz-Navon et al., 2019).

In this regard, leaders’ “behaviors are available and easy to understand” (Katz-Navon et al., 2019, pp. 33). Consistency, in the context of situational strength, denotes that workplace duties and responsibilities are compatible with one another – for example, when information from individuals (such as leaders) is consistent across time (Meyer et al., 2010). Thus, high levels of consistency require leaders’ behaviours toward followers be compatible with each other. When leaders engage in both positive and negative leadership behaviours, these behaviours are likely considered incompatible with one another, resulting in a weak situation for followers.

**Leaders as Attitude Objects**

A more comprehensive understanding of leadership could be achieved from a rapprochement with social psychology. A case in point: Lee, Martin, Thomas, Guillaume and Maio (2015) assert that the study of leadership could be enhanced by thinking of leadership ratings as attitudes that followers hold toward their leaders. Attitudes are typically defined as
evaluations of objects in terms of their favourability (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993) and attitude objects can be almost anything, including individuals or social groups (Abelson, Kinder, Peters, & Fiske, 1982; MacDonald & Zanna, 1998). Leadership ratings align well with this conceptualization because they are typically subjective evaluations about leaders made by their followers (Lee et al., 2015). Attitudes can vary on a number of dimensions related to their structure and strength. For example, they can fluctuate in their extremity, accessibility and importance to individuals. In addition, attitudes can be multidimensional rather than unidimensional. Attitude ambivalence represents this type of evaluative conflict – that is, when individuals evaluate attitude objects as simultaneously positive and negative (Thompson, Zanna, & Griffin, 1995).

**Attitude Ambivalence**

Ambivalence in organizations has recently gained recognition (Ashforth, Rogers, Pratt, & Pradies, 2014); indeed, experiencing simultaneously positive and negative attitudes or emotional and cognitive orientations toward individuals, situations, duties and ideas are increasingly acknowledged as inherent to organizational life (Ashforth et al., 2014; Rothman, Pratt, Rees, & Vogus, 2017). Ambivalence has also been described as having torn emotions or mixed cognitions – or feeling something that does not match your beliefs (Thompson et al., 1995). Previous research has examined ambivalence toward members of certain social groups such as politicians, feminists and lawyers (Abelson et al., 1982; MacDonald & Zanna, 1998; Refling et al., 2013), with such research establishing that reporting positive evaluations about an individual does not imply the absence of negative evaluations. Attitude ambivalence has also been examined in highly interdependent interpersonal relationships, including ambivalence toward
parents and romantic partners – highlighting that interdependent relationships are susceptible to evaluative conflict (Fincham & Linfield, 1997; Maio, Fincham, & Lycett, 2000).

Indicators of attitude ambivalence can be referred to as structural or subjective (Priester & Petty, 1996; Thompson et al., 1995). Structural indicators of ambivalence consider the number of positive and negative reactions that individuals have toward an attitude object rather than whether or not individuals recognize their evaluations are mixed (Kaplan, 1972; Refling et al., 2013). Subjective ambivalence considers the psychological conflict individuals experience when their emotions, cognitions and reactions to an attitude object are conflicted, mixed or indecisive (Priester & Petty, 1996), and subjective ambivalence is often considered the mechanism through which ambivalence exerts its effects on outcomes (Rothman et al., 2017). In general, ambivalence is an unpleasant and undesirable state that causes discomfort and anxiety (Hass, Katz, Rizzo, Bailey, & Moore, 1992; Newby-Clark, McGregor, & Zanna, 2002). Indeed, interactions with individuals about whom one feels ambivalent are associated with negative cardiovascular outcomes (Holt-Lunstad, Uchino, Smith, Olson-Cerny, & Nealey-Moore, 2003; Uchino, Holt-Lunstad, Uno, & Flinders 2001), reduced psychological health (Uchino, Holt-Lunstad, Smith, & Bloor, 2004) and avoidance (Ashforth et al., 2014).

Considering that the leader-follower relationship is both highly interdependent and important (particularly for followers; Thomas, Martin, Epitropaki, Guillaume, & Lee, 2013) it is unsurprising that research has begun to consider attitude ambivalence towards leaders (e.g., Herr et al., 2019; Ingram, 2012; Lee, Thomas, Martin, & Guillaume, 2017). Organizational leaders are particularly important attitude objects for three reasons. First, leaders typically influence employees’ ability to fulfil their goals and achieve important work outcomes (e.g., job security, promotions; Anderson & Galinsky, 2006; Nahum-Shani et al., 2014). Second, a wide array of
follower well-being outcomes are associated with the quality of organizational leadership (for a review see Mullen & Kelloway, 2011). Finally, the supervisor-subordinate relationship is hard to terminate (Methot, Melwani, & Rothman, 2017).

I have previously described the impact of leader behaviour on followers, however, considering that evaluations about individuals may involve inferences about traits and attributes, I now turn my attention to how perceived inconsistencies between leader attributes may impact followers’ evaluations. The most commonly studied leader traits are gender and attributes related to task competence and interpersonal characteristics (DeRue et al., 2011). When considered in terms of social cognition, task performance and interpersonal attributes are often broadly categorized into the dimensions of competence and warmth respectively (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007).

**Warmth, Competence and Gender**

Attitudes can be based on different components or sources of information (Petty, Fabrigar, & Wegener, 2003). The most commonly studied attitude bases are affective and cognitive (behavioural bases are studied to a lesser extent). The affective component includes positive and negative feelings associated with the attitude object, whereas the cognitive component includes beliefs and perceptions about the attitude object (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Zanna & Rempel, 1988). Attitudes about individuals are frequently both cognitively and affectively-based. For example, warmth, liking and communion reflect the affective evaluative dimension whereas competence, respect and agency reflect the cognitive evaluative dimension (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007; Fiske et al., 2007; Rosenberg, Nelson, & Vivekanathan, 1968). Fiske et al. (2007) argue that the dimensions of warmth and competence are at the forefront of social
cognition because together they provide information about individuals in terms of both their intentions (e.g., warmth) and their ability to enact those intentions (e.g., competence).

Warmth and competence are generally considered to be orthogonal dimensions (Fiske et al., 2007) which would suggest that ratings on one dimension (e.g., warmth) would be independent and, thus, unrelated to those on the other dimension (e.g., competence). However, other research suggests that, in trait and person research, rather than orthogonal constructs, warmth and competence are mutually informative dimensions (Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005; Brannon, Sacchi, & Gawronski, 2017) meaning that people make lay assumptions that individuals high on one dimension will be high on the other dimension (i.e., assume a positive relationship between warmth and competence). In general, warmth is considered the primary dimension, because individuals’ intentions (whether good or bad) ought to be more important than whether or not they can act upon them. However, individuals’ competence determines how much attention must be devoted to those intentions (Fiske, 2018). For the leader-follower relationship, one can infer that – for followers – both leaders’ warmth and competence are highly relevant – indeed, transformational leadership combines both competence and warmth (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011).

Competence in the workplace may be more highly valued than in other contexts. Thus, for leaders, competence may be the primary dimension (Cuddy et al., 2011; Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, & Ristikari, 2011). Leaders must demonstrate competence in their leadership role in order to earn respect and trust from followers, whereas the display of leader character (e.g., being friendly, warm, likeable and honest; Homer & Batra, 1994; Garramone, Steele, & Pinkleton, 1991) is considered “necessary but not sufficient for effective leadership” (Hannah & Avolio, 2011, p. 979). Thus, research surrounding leader character and competence has some parallels
with studies based on warmth and competence (Sturm, Vera, & Crossan, 2017). In the leadership domain, character and competence have been advanced as the building blocks of positive leadership (Hannah & Avolio, 2011), and their ‘entanglement’ is proposed to contribute to extraordinary leadership performance (Sturm et al., 2017). These propositions are in line with followers’ expectations of their leaders.

Implicit leadership theories (ILTs) suggest that individuals have prototypical views of what characteristics a leader ought to have (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984). That is, individuals develop personalized schemas that prescribe the traits and behaviours they expect from their leaders. Attributes, such as leaders’ gender, also contribute to perceptions of desirable leadership characteristics, and may also be an important component of evaluative conflict. This is because expectations about the ideal attributes and behaviours of individuals vary based on gender. For example, social role theory indicates that expectations for women and men are different in both descriptive terms ‘what they are like’, and prescriptive terms ‘what they should be like’ (Eagly, 1987; Terborg, 1977). Women are expected to be communal whereas men are expected to display more agentic qualities, and when individuals display behaviour that is inconsistent with their sex role, they can be evaluated negatively (Eagly, 1987; Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000). This is especially problematic in the leadership context because expectations for how women ought to act can contradict expectations of how leaders should behave (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Gender notwithstanding, Epitropaki and Martin (2004) found that several leader characteristics were highly valued by diverse followers. Two of these characteristics fall within the evaluative dimensions of warmth and competence referred to above. Specifically, individuals expect that leaders will be both sensitive (e.g., understanding, sincere, helpful) and intelligent (e.g., knowledgeable, clever, educated) respectively (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004).
The Current Research

Using the work stress framework (Pratt & Barling, 1988), the current research investigates the impact of inconsistent leader behaviours and attributes on followers’ work-related outcomes. This framework suggests that workplace events can act as stressors. Stress can occur based upon individuals’ appraisal of events and, finally, strain represents outcomes (i.e., psychological or physiological) of workplace stress. I posit that inconsistent leader behaviour represents a workplace stressor. When followers experience evaluative conflict toward their leader (i.e., subjective ambivalence; Priester & Petty, 1996), I argue that stress occurs. Finally, I posit that resulting stress (i.e., subjective ambivalence) contributes to negative workplace outcomes (i.e., strains). Taken together, I hypothesize that leader inconsistencies would lead to an appraisal process (i.e., subjective ambivalence) that mediates the relationship between leader inconsistencies and two broad categories of outcomes, namely leader-related and individual follower-related outcomes (Schyns & Shilling, 2013). Leader-related outcomes include negative reactions toward leaders such as avoidance and attitudinal responses including reduced trust. Individual follower-related outcomes include increases in role ambiguity, negative affectivity and strain (for a visual representation, see Figure 1). The role of leader gender will also be considered in this research.
In Study 1, I use an experimental vignette methodology design with employed adults to examine whether followers’ attitude ambivalence mediates the effects of leader inconsistency on follower outcomes. To do so, participants were randomly assigned to scenarios that describe fictional leaders who varied in their level of transformational leadership or abusive supervision behaviours.

Study 2 replicates and extends Study 1, inasmuch as I again focus on transformational leadership and abusive supervision, but also include passive leadership. In addition, Study 2 uses a survey design with adults employed full-time who evaluate their organizational leaders to enhance the generalizability of the findings of Study 1.

Finally, Study 3 uses an experimental methodology with a student sample to examine whether followers’ attitude ambivalence mediates the effects of leader inconsistency across two
attributes, namely warmth and competence, on follower outcomes. In addition, I examine whether leader gender moderates the relationship between warmth and competence and subjective ambivalence because of the importance ascribed to gender in the leadership process by both social role theory and role congruity theory (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Karau, 2002, Eagly et al., 2000). Last, I examine the relationship between two types of structural ambivalence (i.e., within- and between-dimension) and perceived control at work (Schat & Kelloway, 2000; Sutton & Kahn, 1987).

Thus, the primary goal of this dissertation was to understand how perceptions of leaders’ attributes and behaviours predict followers’ attitude ambivalence and workplace outcomes. This program of research expands upon the existing leadership literature by simultaneously examining positive and negative leader behaviours and attributes. Across three studies, I examine the indirect effects of leader inconsistencies on follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence using experimental and survey designs.
Chapter 2:

Inconsistent leadership behaviours, subjective attitude ambivalence and follower outcomes:

An experimental study (Study 1)

At present, little is known about how perceptions of different leadership behaviours interact to produce attitudes in followers. Previous research has established that followers can experience subjective ambivalence toward the leader-follower relationship (i.e., LMX relationship; Ingram, 2012; Lee et al., 2017). Similarly, ambivalence has been shown to increase as more conflicting information about an individual is available (Priester & Petty, 1996). Thus, when leaders enact both positive and negative leadership behaviours, these behaviours conflict and are incompatible with one another (Meyer et al., 2010). For example, experiencing abusive supervision in addition to transformational leadership could result in followers evaluating their leaders simultaneously positively and negatively. I posit that when followers perceive that their leaders’ transformational leadership is interspersed with abusive supervision, they will experience increased ambivalence toward leaders.

Previous studies examining inconsistent leader behaviours have shown that positive leadership behaviours (e.g., ethical leadership, transformational leadership, LMX, supportive leadership) can co-occur with various forms of supervisor aggression (e.g. abusive supervision, undermining and incivility) relating to a variety of negative outcomes in cross-sectional (Duffy et al., 2002; Mullen et al., 2018) and longitudinal (Hobman et al., 2009, Lian et al., 2012; Nahum-Shani et al., 2014) studies. For example, supervisor support offered in conjunction with supervisor undermining was related to reduced self-efficacy and organizational commitment as well as increased counterproductive work behaviours and somatic complaints in followers (Duffy et al. 2002). Similarly, supervisor support buffered the negative impact of supervisor
undermining on perceived health and job strain for individuals higher in resources (e.g., self-esteem and quality of work life), but exacerbated the negative effects of supervisor undermining for individuals who were lower in resources (Nahum-Shani et al., 2014). In a separate study, the co-occurrence of abusive supervision and supervisor support lead to increased anxiety and reduced psychological well-being (Hobman et al., 2009). Likewise, abusive supervision in the context of a positive leader-member exchange (LMX) relationship resulted in reduced need satisfaction and increased organizational deviance (Lian et al., 2012). Finally, the co-occurrence of supervisor incivility and transformational leadership was associated with followers’ reduced safety participation (Mullen et al., 2018).

Identifying the processes that underlie leader-follower relationships (i.e., how leader behaviours influence followers) is an important goal in leadership research (Barling, 2014; Yukl, 2013). Several mechanisms have been proposed to explain the impact of simultaneously experiencing supervisor support and undermining on follower outcomes including relational uncertainty (Duffy et al., 2002) and quality of work life (Nahum-Shani et al., 2014). Lian et al. (2012) showed that basic needs satisfaction mediated the effects abusive supervision on organizational deviance within an LMX relationship. Subjective ambivalence has been considered as a negative affective response that acts as a mechanism to outcomes (see Rothman et al., 2017). In line with this idea, negative affect acted as a mediator between relational ambivalence (in the context of LMX) and task performance (Lee et al., 2017). In this research, I propose that subjective ambivalence will explain how a diverse range of inconsistent leadership behaviours impact followers.

1 For QWL, perceived health was non-significant, but physical health symptoms were significant in Study 3.
**H1**: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership, abusive supervision) and follower outcomes (i.e., leader avoidance, desire to replace the leader, cognitive and affective trust, negative and positive affect).

Considering that inconsistent leader behaviour has been linked to unfavorable impacts on followers’ psychological well-being, job strain, and organizational deviance (Duffy et al., 2002; Hobman et al., 2009; Lian et al., 2012; Nahum-Shani et al., 2014), there are a number of relevant outcomes worthy of examination in the present study. I will focus on two broad categories of outcomes, namely reactions and attitudes directed toward leaders, and individual follower-related outcomes; Schyns & Shilling, (2013). Leader-related outcomes include negative reactions toward leaders such as avoidance and attitudinal responses including a desire to replace the leader and reduced trust. Individual follower-related outcomes include negative affect and positive affect, each of which are described below. See Figure 2 for the hypothesized model.
Figure 2: Hypothesized relationships: Study 1.

**Leader-related Outcomes**

**Leader Avoidance.** Subordinates use subtle resistance tactics when responding to leaders who enact abusive supervision (Tepper, Duffy, & Shaw, 2001). Actions such as procrastination or ignoring supervisors can be explained away as oversights, but are ultimately dysfunctional organizational behaviours (i.e., motivated behaviour that has negative consequences for individuals or organizations; Griffin, O’Leary-Kelly, & Collins, 1998). Thus, avoiding or ignoring leaders represents a form of follower resistance (Bligh, Kohles, Pearce, Justin, & Stoval, 2007). Avoidance has also been shown to be a response to inconsistent behaviour; coworkers avoided individuals who displayed a high degree of unpredictability and inconsistency in their interpersonal interactions (Côté et al., 2011). Similarly, avoidance is considered a common response to the experience of ambivalence (Ashforth et al., 2014; Rothman et al., 2017) leading to my next hypothesis:
H1a: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership and leader avoidance.

Replacing the Leader. The ability to vote to replace individuals in leadership roles is more common in union and political domains (Carty & Blake, 1999; Schwartz & Hoyman, 1984) than typical organizations. Nonetheless, if followers do not perceive their leaders to match their expectations or prototypes (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Hogg, 2001; Lord et al., 1984) they may be more likely to want to select another leader (Van Vugt & De Cremer, 1999). Leaders who enact inconsistent decision-making are evaluated as less fair and considered more replaceable by followers (De Cremer, 2003). Thus, if followers were given the opportunity, my next hypothesis states that:

H1b: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership and a desire to replace the leader.

Trust. Trust is critical in an organizational context because interpersonal exchanges underscore a large portion of organizational life (McAllister, 1995). Trust is defined as a multi-dimensional construct (i.e., affective and cognitive dimensions) that reflects positive expectations about the words, actions and decisions of another individual (Colquitt, LePine, Piccolo, Zapata, & Rich, 2012; McAllister, 1995). Trust between organizational leaders and followers is essential because these two parties have frequent and important interactions (Duffy & Ferrier, 2003). However, trust in leaders might be even more significant than trust in followers because subordinates have far less control over their leaders’ behaviours than the reverse (Butler, 1991). Followers’ perceptions of their interactions with their leaders play a major role in the development of trust (Ferrin & Dirks, 2002; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Specifically, among other qualities and behaviours, interpersonal skills, technical competence...
and behavioural consistency predict subordinates’ trust in their supervisors (Butler, 1991).

Kelloway, Turner, Barling, and Loughlin (2012) showed that transformational leadership was positively associated with trust, whereas active management by exception and laissez-faire leadership (both negative forms of leadership) were negatively related to trust. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) provides a rationale for why inconsistent leadership could promote follower distrust – inconsistent leader behaviour leads to uncertainty as to whether or not leaders care about and are prepared to invest resources in followers (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), whereas consistent positive leader behaviour indicates both commitment and predictability, two characteristics that promote trust from followers (Burke, Sims, Lazzara, & Salas, 2007). Thus:

\[
H_{1c} \text{ and } H_{1d}: \text{Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership and cognitive (}H_{1c}\text{) and affective trust (}H_{1d}\text{).}
\]

**Individual-related Outcomes**

**Well-being.** Leader behaviour has been implicated in subordinate well-being (Offermann & Hellman, 1996; Skakon, et al., 2010); for example, abusive supervision predicts increased psychological distress and reduced affective well-being (for a review see Martinko et al., 2013). In contrast, positive leadership behaviours, especially transformational leadership, are associated with lower levels of psychological distress and increased job well-being (Arnold et al., 2007; Kuoppala, Lamminpaa, Liira, & Vainio, 2008). Indicators of psychological well-being such as depression, anxiety and burnout “reflect disturbances of affect” (Kelloway, 2017, pp.72). Affect is typically conceptualized as a multidimensional construct with two orthogonal dimensions (i.e., negative and positive affect; Bradburn, 1969; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Importantly, low levels of negative affect do not imply high levels of positive affect (nor the inverse). Both
leader emotional displays and leader support have been linked to follower affect (Lewis, 2000; Madjar, Oldham, & Pratt, 2002).

Additionally, individuals felt more negative affect when interacting with well-acquainted individuals who displayed high levels of inconsistent interpersonal social behaviours (Côté et al., 2011). In a similar way, the experience of ambivalence toward a leader is likely to elicit negative affective responses (Lee et al., 2017) leading to the following hypotheses:

\textit{H1e: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership and negative affect, such that inconsistent leadership will be indirectly and positively associated with negative affect.}

\textit{H1f: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership and positive affect, such that inconsistent leadership will be indirectly and negatively associated with positive affect.}

**Leader Gender**

Leader gender has not been considered in any previous research investigating the impact of inconsistent leadership on followers. However, both social role and role congruity theories suggest that men and women are evaluated negatively when they behave in a manner inconsistent with their sex role (Eagly, 1987; Eagly et al., 2000, Eagly & Karau, 2002). In a leadership context, the impact could be even more detrimental to female leaders because expectations for leaders and beliefs about how women ought to act can be contradictory (Eagly & Karau, 2002). For example, the moderating influence of leader gender has been examined in cross-sectional dyadic research examining the impact of benevolent and authoritarian leader behaviours separately (Wang, Chiang, Tsai, Lin & Cheng, 2010). Across two studies, the positive effect of benevolent leadership on followers’ performance was stronger for male than
for female leaders – whereas the negative relationship between authoritarian leadership and follower performance was stronger for female than for male leaders (Wang et al., 2010). Thus, the leaders’ gender may play a role in evaluative conflict in followers, leading to a supplemental hypothesis:

H2: The relationships between inconsistent leadership (i.e., the co-occurrence of abusive supervision and transformational leadership) and follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence will be moderated by leader gender.

To test my hypotheses, I used an experimental vignette methodology (EVM; Aguinis & Bradley, 2014) and randomly assigned participants to one of 8 cells (i.e., 3 conditions with 2 levels each) in a 2 (transformational leadership) x 2 (abusive supervision) x 2 (gender) design. This design involved individuals being presented with one written scenario and responding to questions that required them to make explicit judgements, decisions and choices. EVM was ideal for the current research question because it maximized internal validity and allowed for ethical random assignment to conditions that included abusive supervision – without actually exposing participants to abusive behaviours (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014; see also Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2019).

Method

Participants

Four-hundred and one participants who were employed on a full-time basis (i.e., > 37.5 hours per week) were recruited through and compensated in accordance with the terms of the Clearvoice Research Panel (www.clearvoiceresearch.com). On average, participants were 48.07 years old (SD = 10.85; 54% female).

Procedure
This study was conducted online and participants were randomly assigned to one of eight cells in a 2 x 2 x 2 (transformational leadership x abusive supervision x leader gender) between-subjects design. Each vignette presented a description of a leader named Alex or Alexa Clark whose behaviours differed in consistency. Participants in the abusive supervision and transformational leadership cell read the following vignette: *You work for a top software design company that underwent a major downsizing about a year ago. Since the layoffs, employees at all levels of the organization have had extremely heavy workloads and many additional responsibilities. Deadlines have become impossible to meet. You have increasingly found it difficult to complete all of your projects on time. You don’t know how your boss, Alex(a) Clark, will react when you request a deadline extension. At times (s)he motivates you to meet demanding deadlines by sharing her/his vision for the team with you. But (s)he also sometimes reacts with hostility, speaking rudely and criticizing. Despite this negativity, (s)he has repeatedly praised your efforts in front of your colleagues. Within the same day, you have seen her/him yell at and belittle one employee and then provide coaching to another staff member.*

See Appendix A for the study conditions, levels, and remaining vignettes. Respondents were asked to read the scenario carefully and to do their best to consider how they would think, feel and act in the situation.

**Measures**

**Subjective Ambivalence.** Priester and Petty’s (1996) three item scale was modified to measure subjective ambivalence toward the leader (e.g., “How conflicted do you feel toward Alex/Alexa Clark?”; “Do you have mixed reactions toward Alex/Alexa Clark?”). This scale is measured on an 11-point scale where 0 = “feel no conflict at all, feel no indecision at all,

2 The vignettes were pretested on the Queen’s University PSYC 200 participant pool.
completely one-sided reactions”, to 10 = “feel maximum conflict, feel maximum indecision, completely mixed reactions”. An index of subjective ambivalence was computed by averaging responses to the items. All scores are computed such that higher scores indicate higher levels of the construct (see Appendix B for all study measures, all scale reliabilities are displayed in Table 1 on the diagonal).

**Affect and Cognition-based Trust.** Participants answered four items selected from McAllister’s (1995) scale (two from each subscale: affect-based and cognition-based trust; e.g., “I could talk freely to Alexa/Alexa Clark about difficulties I was having at work and know that they would want to listen”; “Alex/Alexa Clark approaches their job with professionalism and dedication”). This scale is rated on a 7-point scale where 1 = “strongly disagree”, and 7 = “strongly agree”.

**Replacing the Leader.** Individuals were asked two items (e.g., “Please indicate how much you would like to replace Alex/Alexa Clark with another leader”) modified from De Cremer (2003) that reflect how much they would like to replace the leaders in the vignettes with another leader. The scale is measured on a 5-point scale where 1 = “not at all”, and 5 = “very much so”.

**Leader Avoidance.** Côté et al.’s (2011) 3-item measure (e.g., “I would ignore Alex/Alexa Clark”; “I would avoid Alex/Alexa Clark”) of social avoidance was used to determine the extent to which participants would avoid the leaders in the vignettes. The measure uses a 5-point scale where 1 = “very little”, and 5 = “a great deal”.

---

3 Several additional scales were included in this experiment that could enable supplementary analysis; hypotheses were not made or tested. All measures presented to participants are in available in Appendix B.
4 Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for scales of three or more items, Spearman-Brown coefficient $\rho$ for two-item scales (Eisinga, te Grotenhuis, & Pelzer, 2012).
Positive and Negative Affect. The 20-item Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS, Watson et al., 1988) was used to measure positive and negative affect (e.g., "interested"; "distressed"). Participants were asked to indicate the extent the adjectives reflected how they feel on a 5-point scale where 1 = “very slightly or not at all”, and 5 = “extremely”.

Manipulation Checks. Participants were asked the extent to which they perceived the leaders to be consistent where 1 = “not at all”, and 5 = “very much so”. They were also asked to indicate the leaders’ gender. Participants also completed leadership scales modified to the experimental setting including measures of Abusive Supervision (5 items Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007; Tepper, 2000) and Transformational Leadership (5 items; modified from Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990) to ensure participants could accurately identify the condition and level to which they were assigned. In the current study the reliabilities for these scales were both acceptable ($\alpha = .97$).

Data Analysis

All data analyses were performed using SPSS25. Taken together, my three hypotheses constitute tests of moderated mediation (or conditional indirect effect models; see Hayes, 2018). I tested the individual hypotheses and the overall conditional indirect effect models using procedures implemented through the PROCESS macro version 3 (http://www.afhayes.com; Hayes, 2018). A series of linear regression equations were estimated in which each dependent variable (e.g., leader avoidance, desire to replace leader, cognitive and affective trust, negative and positive affect) was considered in a separate analysis, with subjective ambivalence as the mediator, transformational leadership as the dichotomous independent variable, and abusive supervision as the dichotomous moderator. I first examined whether the index of moderated mediation was significantly different from zero, which would indicate that the conditional
indirect effects were different from each other (Hayes, 2015). When the index of moderated mediation is significant, it is appropriate to probe further (i.e., examine the conditional indirect effects of transformational leadership on each outcome at lower and higher levels of abusive supervision). Because the sampling distribution of indirect effects is non-normal, I used bias corrected 95% confidence intervals (CI), based on 5,000 bootstrapped resamples to determine the statistical significance of the indirect effects (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004). The indirect effect was significant when the bias-corrected CI for an indirect effect did not include zero. Variables were mean centred to improve the interpretability of results (Hayes, 2018) and unstandardized ordinary least squares regression coefficients are reported for all analyses.

Results

Descriptive statistics, zero-order correlations and reliabilities for all scales used are presented in Table 1.

Before testing the hypotheses, I checked the validity of the manipulations. For the gender manipulation, results showed that 17% misclassified the leaders’ gender (332/401 correctly classified gender). Because gender was a focal variable in this study, only individuals who accurately classified the leaders’ gender were included in all subsequent analyses. Using G*Power, I conducted a sensitivity analysis based on the final sample size, the minimum effect size that this experiment had 80% power to detect was .224. I conducted independent samples t-tests to test the validity of the manipulations. There was a significant difference in the scores between the abusive supervision (M = 5.01, SD = .11) vs. no abusive supervision levels (M = 2.63, SD = 1.47); t(329.76) = 15.18, p < .001. Similarly, there was a significant difference in the scores between the transformational leadership (M = 4.20, SD = 1.62) vs. no transformational
leadership levels ($M = 2.20, SD = 1.41$); $t (317.13) = 11.99, p < .001$, confirming the effectiveness of the manipulations.
Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations and Scale Reliabilities (Study 1; N = 315-322)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cognitive Trust</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Affective Trust</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leader Avoidance</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Replace Leader</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Positive Affect</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Reliabilities are on the diagonal in parentheses. All $r \leq .11, p > .05; r \geq .12$ and $\leq .15, p < .05; r \geq .16, p < .01$

Results of the regression analyses appear in Tables 2 to 7. Hypotheses 1a to 1f posited that inconsistent leadership (i.e., the interaction of abusive supervision and transformational leadership) affected follower outcomes (i.e., avoidance of leader and desire to replace the leader, cognitive and affective trust, as well as negative and positive affect) indirectly, through subjective attitude ambivalence. Supporting H1a, the indirect effects of transformational leadership on leader avoidance through subjective ambivalence are dependent on abusive supervision (see Table 2). More specifically, the indirect effect of transformational leadership on leader avoidance through subjective ambivalence differs at the two levels of abusive supervision (see Figure 2). For non-abusive supervision, the effect is negative ($b = -.334, CI [-.476 to -.206]$) whereas for abusive supervision the effect is positive: ($b = .206, CI [.107 to .319]$). The associated index of moderated mediation was significant ($b = .540, CI [.343, .750]$).
Figure 3. Interaction of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision Predicting Subjective Ambivalence in Study 1.
Table 2

_Moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Leader Avoidance Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 1; \( N = 319 \))_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Leader Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.537</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

|                                      | \( b \)  | SE | 95% CI         |
|                                      |        |    | LLCI | ULCI |
| Non-Abusive Supervision              | -.334  | .069 | -.476 | -.206 |
| Abusive Supervision                  | .206   | .054 | .107  | .319  |
| Index of Moderated Mediation         | .540   | .104 | .343  | .750  |

A similar pattern of results was obtained for hypotheses 1b to 1e, the indirect effects of transformational leadership on follower outcomes (i.e., desire to replace the leader, cognitive trust, affective trust, and negative affect) through subjective ambivalence were dependent on abusive supervision. All associated indices of moderated mediation were significant, for all regression analyses associated with hypotheses 1b to 1e, see Tables 3 to 6. Together, these analyses indicate that the indirect effect of transformational leadership on follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence is moderated by abusive supervision and that the indirect effect of transformational leadership on follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence differs at the two levels of abusive supervision.

For negative outcomes such as a desire to replace the leader and negative affect (see Tables 3 and 6), in the absence of abusive supervision, the effect is negative whereas in the presence of abusive supervision the effect is positive.
The opposite occurs for positive outcomes such as cognitive and affective trust (see Tables 4 and 5), the indirect effect of transformational leadership on cognitive and affective trust through subjective ambivalence differs at the two levels of abusive supervision. In the absence of abusive supervision, the effect is positive whereas in the presence of abusive supervision the effect is negative.
Table 3

*Moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Desire to Replace Leader Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 1; N = 315)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Replace Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.522</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>4.151</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Abusive Supervision</th>
<th>Abusive Supervision</th>
<th>Index of Moderated Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.691</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>1.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.925</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.473</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Cognitive Trust Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 1; N = 320)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Cognitive Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.516</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Abusive Supervision</th>
<th>Abusive Supervision</th>
<th>Index of Moderated Mediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>-.267</td>
<td>-.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

*Moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Affective Trust Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 1; N = 320)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Affective Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.516</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.662 .126 .428 .919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.410 .103 -.623 -.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>-1.072 .188 -1.449 -.715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Negative Affect Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 1; N = 318)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Negative Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.488</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.121 .058 -.242 -.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.077 .042 .005 .170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>.197 .097 .014 .400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The indirect effects of transformational leadership on positive affect through subjective ambivalence was not dependent on abusive supervision (see Table 7). Subjective ambivalence did not mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership and positive affect. The CI for the associated index of moderated mediation contained zero, thus providing no support for Hypothesis 1f.
Table 7

**Moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Positive Affect Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 1; N = 318)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Positive Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.488</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.147 .090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.058 .092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.143 .234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A supplemental analysis was conducted to test Hypothesis 2, which proposed that leader gender would further moderate the proposed model. In the first stage of the model, the 3-way interaction between abusive supervision, transformational leadership and leader gender was not significant, ($b = -.181, CI [-2.057, 1.695]$). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported, and the remainder of the model was not tested.

**Discussion**

The goal of Study 1 was to test whether subjective ambivalence mediated the effects of inconsistent leadership on follower outcomes. With the exception of positive affect (Hypothesis 1f), the findings supported this indirect effect with regard to leader avoidance, desire to replace the leader, trust and negative affect (H1a – H1e). Thus, the impact of inconsistent leadership on follower outcomes was indirect, through subjective ambivalence. What these findings mean is
that any indirect benefits of transformational leadership on these outcomes were reduced if leaders simultaneously engaged in abusive supervision.

In contrast, the indirect effect of inconsistent leadership on positive affect was not mediated by subjective ambivalence (H1f). The divergent results for negative and positive affect in the above analyses may be explained by the finding that negative events and interactions can be more influential than positive experiences with regard to well-being related outcomes (Baumeister et al., 2001; Rook, 1984, 2001; Schuster, Kessler, & Aseltine, 1990). Specifically, “negative information receives more processing and contributes more strongly to the final impression than does positive information” (Baumeister et al., 2001, p. 323). There is broad research support for the idea that bad events generate more emotion and have more enduring effects (for a review see Baumeister et al., 2001).

The affect-matching hypothesis (Major et al., 1997; Zautra, 1983; Zautra & Reich, 1983), which posits that positive and negative affect are distinct dimensions (Watson et al., 1988) with different outcomes (Clark & Watson, 1991), and by extension, different antecedents may also help to explain the current findings. Because negative and positive life events influence their corresponding affective states (Zautra & Reich, 1983), the undesirable nature of inconsistent leadership should be related to negative, but not necessarily positive, affect.

Several possible explanations can be offered for the findings that leaders’ gender did not act as a moderator of the proposed model. First, reading a leadership scenario in which leader gender is manipulated may not be as experientially meaningful as personally interacting with leaders in organizational settings (Burton, Hoobler, & Kernan, 2011). Second, the level of leadership was not stated in the scenario, which may have contributed to an underestimation of the effects, particularly for female leaders. For example, upper management and executive...
positions are typically sex-typed as male (Heilman, 2001), which could contribute to followers evaluating male and female leaders differently.

**Strengths and Limitations**

Prior research has shown the direct effects of inconsistent leadership on negative outcomes for followers (e.g., Duffy et al., 2002; Hobman et al., 2009; Lian et al., 2012; Nahum-Shani et al., 2014). One strength of the current study is that it offers an explanation for this phenomenon. Based on the work stress framework (Pratt & Barling, 1988), the present study supports the proposition that subjective ambivalence is one factor that can account for the negative effects of inconsistent leadership. In addition, random assignment to conditions enables greater confidence in the internal validity of this study.

There were several possible limitations inherent in the current study. First, 17% of the initial sample did not accurately recognize the leaders’ gender and were omitted from further analyses. However, following Thomas and Clifford’s (2017) recommendations, I computed all analyses with and without those who failed the gender manipulation check, and the pattern of results remained the same regardless of whether or not individuals recognized the leaders’ gender, suggesting that the above findings were not significantly impacted by the removal of inattentive respondents. Second, the results of this study were self-reported by one source, however, mono-method bias is unlikely in the presence of significant interactions as these effects are not artifacts of common method variance (Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2010).

Additionally, only one core version of the vignette based on downsizing within a software design organization in the computer sciences industry was adjusted to the manipulated conditions in this study. It is possible that the version selected may have presented some inherent biases for respondents that may not have been the case with a different work context or industry
(e.g., Weber, 1992). There are currently no established guidelines within EVM suggesting the ideal number of versions of vignettes to use (e.g., to establish stimulus generalization), thus, future research may consider using multiple versions in order to overcome what could be a threat to mono-operation bias.

**Future Research Directions**

Study 1 tested only one combination of inconsistent leader behaviours (i.e., abusive supervision and transformational leadership). However, different forms of leader behavioural inconsistency can emerge. For example, a small body of research has focused on the co-occurrence of transformational leadership and passive leadership in both safety-specific (Kelloway et al., 2006; Mullen et al., 2011) and non-safety specific contexts (Breevaart & Zacher, 2019). Thus, a primary goal of Study 2 was to conceptually extend the findings of Study 1 and examine whether subjective ambivalence mediated the effects of the co-occurrence of passive leadership and transformational leadership on follower outcomes.

In addition, the use of a between-subjects experimental design in Study 1 allowed for a controlled evaluation of the effects of both leader behaviours and leader gender on followers’ attitude ambivalence, which provided strong support of the internal validity of the experimental manipulation (Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2019). However, it is important to replicate the mediating effects of subjective ambivalence on the link between inconsistent leadership and follower outcomes across different methods and samples. Thus, a second goal of Study 2 was to replicate and extend the findings of Study 1 on a sample of adults employed on a full-time basis rating their own leaders.

**Conclusion**
Study 1 provided initial support for the relationship between inconsistent leadership (operationalized as the interaction between abusive supervision and transformational leadership), subjective ambivalence and followers’ outcomes in a controlled experiment. As hypothesized, the impact of inconsistent leadership on follower outcomes (with the exception of positive affect) was indirect, through subjective ambivalence.
Chapter 3:

Inconsistent leadership behaviours, subjective attitude ambivalence and follower outcomes:

**Replication and extension (Study 2)**

Study 1 focused on one combination of leader behaviours — transformational leadership and abusive supervision — and offered support for subjective ambivalence as a mechanism through which this form of inconsistency impacts followers. Study 1 provided initial evidence that subjective ambivalence mediates the negative effects of inconsistent leadership on follower outcomes. Randomized experimental studies offer benefits to the development of knowledge about leadership (Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2019). Nonetheless, in an era in which the replicability of findings is attracting much interest, it is important to ensure that any findings are replicated. In the context of my research, therefore, one goal of my second study is to assess whether the findings conceptually replicate when studying actual leader-follower relationships in more realistic organizational contexts. In addition, previous research supporting the idea of inconsistent leadership has shown it can also involve the co-occurrence of passive forms of leadership in addition to transformational leadership. Thus, Study 2 had two major aims – first, to replicate the findings of Study 1 and second, to extend the findings of Study 1 to determine if a similar mechanism underlies another type of inconsistency, the combination of transformational leadership and passive leadership.

Several studies examining the co-occurrence of transformational leadership and passive leadership have been conducted. Cross-sectional research conducted in a safety-specific context shows that positive outcomes (i.e., safety participation and compliance) associated with transformational leadership were attenuated by the presence of passive leadership (Mullen et al., 2011). In a within-person, weekly diary study conducted over five weeks, trust in the leader and
leader effectiveness were reduced in weeks during which leaders showed less (one standard deviation lower) than usual transformational leadership and more (one standard deviation higher) laissez-faire leadership (Breevaart & Zacher, 2019). Conversely, in weeks that leaders showed more (one standard deviation higher) transformational leadership, trust and effectiveness were rated more highly, regardless of leaders’ use of laissez-faire leadership (Breevaart & Zacher, 2019). Finally, in an online experiment, the co-occurrence of passive management-by-exception and transformational leadership behaviours were perceived by participants as inconsistent and unclear (Katz-Navon et al., 2019).

To date, no published studies have examined the co-occurrence of reward and punishment omission and transformational leadership. Reward omission occurs when leaders do not reinforce their followers’ positive performance, whereas punishment omission includes instances when leaders fail to react to followers’ poor performance (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). This form of passive leadership is important because some of the primary responsibilities of leaders include monitoring and responding to followers’ performance (Yukl, 2013) and followers are sensitive to the reinforcement they do (or do not) receive (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Reward and punishment omission are associated with reduced satisfaction with supervision and role clarity (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). In contrast, transformational leadership is typically considered both satisfying and effective (Judge & Picollo, 2004). When leaders fail to respond to either good or bad performance (i.e., reward or punishment omission) in conjunction with enacting transformational leadership behaviours, I posit that these behaviours will be considered discordant with each other and will produce evaluative conflict (i.e., subjective ambivalence) in followers. Thus, I propose that followers who perceive inconsistent leadership will experience increased subjective ambivalence toward the leader.
Leader gender did not act as a moderator in Study 1. In Study 2, I wished to account for the potential importance of leader gender whilst acknowledging the finding that gender differences in leadership ratings tend to dissipate when individuals are rating their own leaders in organizational studies (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Thus, leader gender was considered as a covariate in this study. Follower self-esteem was selected as an additional covariate as previous research indicates that perceived leadership inconsistencies are more detrimental to followers low in self-esteem (De Cremer, 2003; Nahum-Shani et al., 2014).

As discussed in Study 1, subjective attitude ambivalence is an undesirable and unpleasant experience (Newby-Clark et al., 2002; van Harreveld, Rutjens, Schneider, Nohlen, & Keskinis, 2014). Thus, when individuals experience ambivalence toward their leaders, these evaluations might further lead to negative outcomes (e.g., negative reactions toward leaders and reduced follower well-being). I will consider some of the same outcomes as those included in Study 1 to facilitate an assessment of whether the subjective ambivalence also mediates the effects of different forms of inconstant leadership behaviours (see Figure 1 for the conceptual model). Thus, the leader-related outcomes considered in the present research include negative reactions toward leaders such as avoidance, a desire to replace the leader and attitudinal responses including reduced trust, leading to the following hypotheses:

\[ H1a: \text{Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with abusive supervision) and leader avoidance,} \]
\[ (H1b) \text{desire to replace the leader } (H1c) \text{cognitive trust, and } (H1d) \text{affective trust.} \]

\[ 5 \text{ All hypotheses in Study 2 are tested controlling for leader gender and follower self-esteem.} \]
H2a: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with reward omission) and leader avoidance, (H2b) desire to replace the leader (H2c) cognitive trust, and (H2d) affective trust.

H3a: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with punishment omission) and leader avoidance, (H3b) desire to replace the leader (H3c) cognitive trust, and (H3d) affective trust.

One of the primary differences between the first two studies is that Study 1 focused on hypothetical leaders in a vignette, while Study 2 focuses on followers’ evaluations of their actual leaders. As a result, two new outcomes are considered in Study 2, namely role ambiguity and psychological strain.

Role Ambiguity. Role ambiguity occurs when followers are uncertain of their functions or responsibilities (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). The role of leader behaviour in influencing role ambiguity is well supported (Kelloway et al., 2005; O’Driscoll & Beehr, 1994; Singh & Rhoads, 1991). Leaders who provide clear information and expectations that enable employees to perform their work duties reduce role ambiguity (Kahn et al., 1964). In contrast, passive leadership behaviours (e.g., failing to set clear expectations; failing to appropriately reward or punish employees) have been positively related to role ambiguity (Barling & Frone, 2016; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Skogstad, Hetland, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2014). A vast body of research shows that role ambiguity predicts other negative organizational outcomes such as job dissatisfaction, psychological symptoms, and physical symptoms (e.g., Bowling et al., 2017; O’Driscoll & Beehr, 1994). Inconsistent leader behaviour could be linked
to increased role ambiguity because variations in leader behaviour are likely to decrease the amount of clarity followers have at work (Katz-Navon et al., 2019). Thus:

**H1e: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with abusive supervision) and role ambiguity.**

**H2e: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with reward omission) and role ambiguity.**

**H3e: Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with punishment omission) and role ambiguity.**

**Psychological Strain.** Poor leadership in both abusive and passive forms has been linked to increased stress and psychological distress (Skogstad et al., 2007; Tepper, 2000). Kelloway et al. (2005) note that followers who have observed an aggressive outburst from their supervisor may experience both the acute psychological impact of the event and more chronic stress, because they are unable to predict their leaders’ behaviour. Similarly, LaRocco and Jones (1978) found that employees experiencing the highest levels of stress rated their leaders in the mid-range (rather than low) in terms of supportive behaviours. They proposed that inconsistent leader behaviour (supportive in some settings/situations and unsupportive in others) could exert a negative impact on followers because leader inconsistency could limit followers’ development of effective coping strategies. This leads to my next hypotheses:
**H1f:** Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with abusive supervision) and psychological strain.

**H2f:** Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with reward omission) and psychological strain.

**H3f:** Subjective ambivalence will mediate the relationship between inconsistent leadership (i.e., transformational leadership co-occurring with punishment omission) and psychological strain.

**Method**

**Participants**

Two-hundred and fifty-five participants who were employed on a full-time basis were recruited by and compensated in accordance with the terms of the Clearvoice Research Panel (www.clearvoiceresearch.com). The mean age of the participants was 44.4 years ($SD = 11.81$; 60% female), and the average tenure with their leader was 6.5 years ($SD = 7.23$). Individuals worked between 35-72 hours per week ($M = 41.82$, $SD = 5.29$) and the study was completed online. I used G*Power 3.1 to conduct a sensitivity analysis. The minimum effect size that this study had 80% power to detect was .061.

**Measures**

All scale reliabilities are reported in Table 8.

---

6 The industry and occupation of participants was not asked.

7 Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for scales of three or more items, Spearman-Brown coefficient $\rho$ for two-item scales (Eisinga, te Grotenhuis, & Pelzer, 2012).
**Abusive Supervision.** Participants completed the 15-item Abusive Supervision scale (e.g., “ridicules me”; “gives me the silent treatment”) which measures followers’ perceptions of their leaders’ abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000), with items rated on a 5-point scale where 1 = “I cannot remember them ever using this behavior with me”, and 5 = “They use this behavior very often with me”. All scales were computed such that higher scores indicate more of the construct.

**Reward and Punishment Omission.** Participants completed an 8-item measure of passive leadership (e.g., “When I perform well my manager usually does nothing”; “My manager gives me no feedback when I perform poorly”) which is focused on whether or not their leader appropriately enacted punishment and reward omission (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008), with items rated on a 5-point scale where 1 = “strongly disagree”, and 5 = “strongly agree”.

**Transformational Leadership.** Podsakoff et al.’s (1990, 1996) 22-item measure of transformational leadership (e.g., “My leader is always seeking new opportunities for the department” and “My leader leads by example”) was used to measure transformational leadership behaviours. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale where 1 = “not at all”, and 5 = “frequently, if not always”.

**Subjective Ambivalence.** Subjective ambivalence toward the leader was measured with the same three items modified from Priester and Petty (1996) used in Study 1.

**Leader Avoidance.** The same 3-item measure of social avoidance used in Study 1 (Côté et al., 2011) was used to determine how often participants avoided their leaders in the past month.
Desire to Replace the Leader. Individuals were asked the same two items used in Study 1 (modified from De Cremer, 2003), which measured how much they would like to replace their leader with another leader.

Affect and Cognition-based Trust. Participants completed McAllister’s (1995) 11-item scale to assess affect-based and cognition-based trust in their leader (e.g., “We would both feel a sense of loss if one of us was transferred and we could no longer work together”; “This person approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication”), rated on a 7-point scale where 1 = “strongly disagree”, and 7 = “strongly agree”.

Role Ambiguity. Four items (House, Schuler, & Levanoni, 1983) assessed role ambiguity (e.g., “I have clear planned goals and objectives for my job”; “I know exactly what is expected of me”). Responses were rated on a 4-point scale where 1 = “strongly disagree”, and 4 = “strongly agree”.

Psychological Strain. The GHQ-12 (Goldberg, 1972) was used to measure general psychological strain (e.g., “Have you recently: been able to concentrate on whatever you’re doing?”; “felt capable of making decisions about things?”), measured on a 4-point scale where 1 = “not at all”, and 5 = “much more than usual”.

Self-esteem. Participants completed Rosenberg’s (1965) 10-item self-esteem scale (e.g., “I am able to do things as well as most other people”) on a 4-point scale where 1 = “strongly disagree”, and 4 = “strongly agree”.
**Demographic Variables.** Participants were asked to provide their own and their leaders’ gender, their own age and the length of time they had been working with their current supervisor. See Appendix C for all study measures.

**Data Analysis**

The same data analysis approach used in Study 1 was implemented in Study 2 and is fully described in the Data Analysis section for Study 1. I estimated a series of linear regression equations in which the mediator (i.e., subjective ambivalence) was regressed on the continuous leadership variables (i.e., transformational leadership in conjunction with 1. abusive supervision, 2. reward omission and 3. punishment omission and their interactions. When there was evidence of moderation of the indirect effect, I examined the conditional indirect effects of transformational leadership on each outcome at lower, mean, and higher levels of the moderator. Leader gender and follower self-esteem were used as covariates in all analyses.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics, zero-order correlations and reliabilities for all scales used are presented in Table 8.

Together my hypotheses propose that, after controlling for leader gender and follower self-esteem, inconsistent leadership affects follower outcomes (i.e., leader avoidance, desire to replace the leader, cognitive and affective trust, role ambiguity, and psychological strain) indirectly, through subjective ambivalence (see Figure 1 for the conceptual model). Hypotheses 1a to 1f constitute tests of moderated mediation and results of the regression analyses appear in Tables 9 to 14. Supporting Hypothesis 1a, the indirect effects of transformational leadership on

---

8 Several additional scales were included in this survey to enable supplementary analysis; hypotheses were not made or tested. All measures presented to participants are in available in Appendix C.
leader avoidance through subjective ambivalence is moderated by abusive supervision (see Table 9). The associated index of moderated mediation is significant ($b = .079$, CI [.003, .175]), and the conditional indirect effects of transformational leadership on leader avoidance through subjective ambivalence are significant at all levels of abusive supervision (higher: $b = -.125$, CI [-.235 to -.003]; mean: $b = -.224$, CI [-.325 to -.138]; lower: $b = -.235$, CI [-.343 to -.142]). However, the indirect effect of transformational leadership on leader avoidance through subjective ambivalence differed at the three levels of abusive supervision. Specifically, the coefficients associated with higher, mean and lower abusive supervision suggest that the interaction effects of abusive supervision on transformational leadership are stronger at mean and lower levels of abusive supervision. At higher levels of abusive supervision, the interaction effect is weaker, consistent with the visual depiction of the interaction in Figure 4.
Figure 4. Interaction of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision predicting Subjective Ambivalence in Study 2.
Table 8.

*Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations and Scale Reliabilities (Study 2; N = 238-249).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SE</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AS</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TFL</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RO</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PO</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SA</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CT</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AT</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RA</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. AL</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. RL</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PS</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Reliabilities are on the diagonal in parentheses. All scales were coded such that higher numbers reflect more of the construct. SE = Self-esteem, AS = Abusive Supervision, TFL = Transformational Leadership, RO = Reward Omission, PO = Punishment Omission, SA = Subjective Ambivalence, CT = Cognitive Trust, AT = Affective Trust, RA = Role Ambiguity, AL = Avoid Leader, RL = Replace Leader, PS = Psychological Strain. All $r \leq .12, p > .05$; $r \geq .13$ and $\leq .16, p < .05$; $r \geq .17, p < .01$
Table 9

*Moderated Meditational Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Leader Avoidance Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 2; N = 238)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Leader Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.431</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Gender</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.922</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional Indirect Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar pattern of results was obtained for Hypotheses 1b to 1e, all of which were supported. Specifically, the indirect effects of transformational leadership on follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence were dependent on abusive supervision. All associated indices of moderated mediation were significant for Hypotheses 1b through 1e (Tables 10 to 13). Together, these analyses indicate that the indirect effect of transformational leadership on follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence is moderated by abusive supervision. Additionally, the slopes of the three lines differ significantly, indicating that the effects of transformational leadership on subjective ambivalence are not the same across the different levels of abusive supervision. Considering H1b to 1e, the coefficients associated with mean and lower levels of abusive supervision were significant for all outcomes (i.e., desire to replace the leader, cognitive
and affective trust, and role ambiguity). The coefficients suggest that the interaction effect at higher levels of abusive supervision is weaker than at mean and lower levels. Nonetheless, at high levels of abusive supervision the coefficients associated with the outcomes of cognitive and affective trust and role ambiguity were significant. However, those associated with the desire to replace the leader (see Table 10), were non-significant.
Table 10

*Moderated Meditational Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Desire to Replace Leader Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 2; N = 234).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Replace Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (\text{SE}) (95% \text{CI})</td>
<td>(b) (\text{SE}) (95% \text{CI})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{LLCI}) (\text{ULCI})</td>
<td>(\text{LLCI}) (\text{ULCI})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.419 .220 -.853 .016</td>
<td>.114 .119 -.121 .349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Gender</td>
<td>.043 .263 -.474 .560</td>
<td>-.102 .142 -.382 .178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.921 .171 -1.258 -.584</td>
<td>-.553 .089 -.729 -.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.161 .178 .811 1.511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.404 .148 .112 .697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>.235 .033 .170 .300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

- Lower Abusive Supervision: -.270 .062 -.400 -.157
- Mean Abusive Supervision: -.257 .059 -.380 -.150
- Higher Abusive Supervision: -.137 .067 -.265 .003
- Index of Moderated Mediation: .095 .050 .010 .207
### Table 11

**Moderated Mediational Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Cognitive Trust Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 2; N = 239)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Cognitive Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )    ( SE )  95% CI</td>
<td>( B )    ( SE )  95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI  ULCI</td>
<td>LLCI  ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.439       .220  -.872  -.006</td>
<td>.098       .106  -.111  .307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Gender</td>
<td>.135        .261  -.380  .649</td>
<td>.229       .126  -.019  .476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.917       .171  -1.253  -.581</td>
<td>.790       .079  .635  .946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.129       .178  .778  1.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.382        .148  .089  .674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.132    .029  -.190  -.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conditional Indirect Effects**

|                                                  | \( b \)    \( SE \)  95% CI |
|                                                  |             LLCI  ULCI                |
| Lower Abusive Supervision                       | .149        .044  .074  .240 |
| Mean Abusive Supervision                        | .142        .042  .071  .229 |
| Higher Abusive Supervision                      | .080        .041  .004  .167 |
| Index of Moderated Mediation                    | -.050       .030  -.118  -.001 |
Table 12

*Moderated Mediational Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Affective Trust Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 2; N = 237)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Affective Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>( SE )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.436</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Gender</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.925</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Abusive Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Abusive Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Abusive Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Role Ambiguity Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 2; N = 239)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Role Ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.439</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Gender</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.917</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional Indirect Effects

|                                    | $b$     | SE  | 95% CI     |
| Lower Abusive Supervision          | -.047   | .019 | -.086 | -.014 |
| Mean Abusive Supervision           | -.045   | .018 | -.082 | -.013 |
| Higher Abusive Supervision         | -.025   | .014 | -.057 | -.001 |
| Index of Moderated Mediation       | .016    | .011 | .000 | .040 |

H1f, which predicted that the interaction of transformational leadership and abusive supervision would predict psychological strain through subjective ambivalence, was not supported. Subjective ambivalence did not predict psychological strain, and the bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals for the index of moderated mediation contained zero ($b = -.007, CI [-.002, .022])$, (see Table 14).
Table 14

 moderated Mediation Analysis: Effects of Transformational Leadership and Abusive Supervision on Psychological Strain Through Subjective Ambivalence (Study 2; N = 239)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Mediator = Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>DV = Psychological Strain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.439</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Gender</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-.917</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL x Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Abusive Supervision</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reward omission did not moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and subjective ambivalence, $b = -.139$, CI [-.378, .101], disconfirming Hypothesis 2a. Similarly, punishment omission did not moderate the relationship between transformational leadership and subjective ambivalence, $b = .290$, CI [-.026, .606], which failed to support Hypothesis 3a. Accordingly, the remaining hypotheses were not tested.

To examine the robustness of these findings, I examined the results of all analysis when the covariates were not included. With the exception of those related to H1f, which become significant indicating that self-esteem and psychological distress represent constructs with shared variance, results were unchanged.
Discussion

Study 2 examined different “types” of inconsistent leader behaviours using a survey design with employed individuals who reported on their leaders’ behaviours. With the exception of psychological strain (which was not included in Study 1), the findings replicated those of Study 1, specifically, the effects of inconsistent leadership behaviours (i.e., abusive supervision and transformational leadership) were indirectly related to follower outcomes through ratings of subjective ambivalence. However, this phenomenon did not extend to reward or punishment omission, neither of which moderated the relationship between transformational leadership and subjective ambivalence.

Several factors might account for the null findings relating to reward and punishment omission. First, both reward and punishment omission are operationalized as the absence of critical management behaviours, and it is possible that more overt negative behaviours (e.g., abusive supervision) are required to produce subjective ambivalence in followers. Second, certain types of passive leadership may be more salient to followers, and more likely to result in subjective ambivalence. Previous research examining the moderating effect of passive leadership on transformational leadership examined passive-avoidant leadership (Avolio et al., 1999) rather than reward and punishment omission (Breevaart & Zacher, 2019; Mullen et al., 2011). These behaviours might signal to followers that leaders do not truly care about them and are not willing to invest resources in them (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) in a way that reward and punishment omission behaviours (which are focused on reinforcement behaviours; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008) do not. Finally, although punishment omission is conceptualized as a negative form of non-leadership, perhaps followers do not perceive it as such — indeed, they may be relieved to escape punishment when things go wrong.
Nonetheless, replicating Study 1, I found a moderated mediation effect of transformational leadership and abusive supervision relating to an array of follower outcomes (namely leader avoidance, desire to replace the leader, trust and role ambiguity) through subjective ambivalence. Again, the impact of inconsistent leadership on follower outcomes was indirect, through subjective ambivalence. However, one hypothesized outcome did not conform to the proposed moderated mediation model, namely the path between subjective ambivalence and psychological strain was not significant in the model. This result aligns with other recent findings that ambivalent reactions did not predict unique variance in self-reported well-being above and beyond the negative (Gilligan, Suitor, Feld, & Pillemer, 2015) and positive (Herr et al., 2019) components of those reactions. Objective measures of physiological stress, however, were predicted uniquely by ambivalence (Herr et al., 2019), highlighting the need to consider objective measures in addition to self-reports in future research.

In the current study, the interaction effect at higher levels of abusive supervision was weaker than at mean and lower levels, highlighting the negative impact of high levels of abusive supervision, irrespective of the level of transformational leadership. Interestingly, high levels of abusive supervision produced subjective ambivalence in followers, even when it would not have been classified as inconsistent (i.e., when transformational leadership was low). This may highlight a type of inconsistency not yet considered – when current leaders are not consistent with followers’ implicit expectations. ILT outlines the cognitive schemas followers possess regarding leaders in a broad sense, including the expected behaviours and attributes of ideal leaders (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Junker & van Dick, 2014; Lord & Maher, 1994). Specifically, findings from ILT research (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004) show that followers expect their leaders to be dynamic, sensitive, intelligent and dedicated and do not expect them to be
tyrannical. In the current study, the enactment of abusive supervision may have been considered anti-prototypical leader behaviour and thus inconsistent with followers’ expectations of their leaders, producing subjective ambivalence (i.e., conflict, indecision and mixed reactions) in the followers in this study.

**Strengths and Limitations**

Results from Studies 1 and 2, using different methods and samples, provide robust support for the conclusion that the effects of inconsistent leadership behaviours (i.e., abusive supervision and transformational leadership) on follower outcomes were indirect, through subjective ambivalence.

Nonetheless, although the cross-sectional, self-report design of this study may have inflated the observed results, several features inherent in this study reduce the possibility that mono-method biases threaten the current findings. First, the results pertaining to inconsistency between transformational leadership and abusive supervision replicate the model tested in Study 1 in a different sample; arguably, replication across samples and methods provides greater confidence in the robustness of this finding. In addition, mono-method bias is unlikely when significant interactions emerge, because interaction effects cannot be artifacts of common method variance (Siemsen et al., 2010).

**Future Research Directions**

Considering the challenges of detecting moderation effects in cross-sectional survey research (Aguinis, 1995; McClelland & Judd, 1993), future experimental studies could clarify the relationships between inconsistent leadership arising from different leader behaviours and subjective ambivalence more effectively. Accordingly, in Study 3 I will also extend the concept of leader inconsistency to consider the underlying affective and cognitive dimensions most
commonly associated with social cognition namely, warmth and competence (Fiske et al., 2007). Viewing leadership within the framework of warmth and competence is important because, these two dimensions provide information to followers about leaders’ intentions (e.g., warmth) and their ability to enact those intentions (e.g., competence; Fiske et al., 2007).

Support for the mediating role of subjective ambivalence emerges from two separate studies using different samples and different methods. However, it is important to also consider the role of structural ambivalence (i.e., the result of individuals holding conflicting attitudes of which they may not be aware) in the relationship between leader inconsistency and follower outcomes related to perceived control at work (e.g., Karasek, 1979; Sutton & Kahn, 1987).

**Conclusion**

Study 2 replicated the findings of Study 1 in a survey design using employees who rated their actual leaders; with subjective ambivalence again playing mediating role between inconsistent leadership and follower outcomes. This study adds to the existing literature suggesting that the co-occurrence of supervisor aggression and positive leadership behaviours can exert negative influences on followers (e.g., Lian et al., 2012; Mullen et al., 2018; Nahum-Shani et al., 2014). In Study 3, I extend these findings by examining a different type of leader inconsistency in an experimental design.
Chapter 4: Inconsistent leadership attributes, subjective and structural ambivalence and follower outcomes: An experimental investigation (Study 3)

Studies 1 and 2 offered strong support for subjective ambivalence as a mediator between one type of leader inconsistency (i.e., transformational leadership and abusive supervision) and follower outcomes. Study 3 has two major aims, the first of which is to extend the findings of Studies 1 and 2 and determine whether subjective ambivalence mediates the relationship between another type of inconsistency – the combination of leaders’ warmth and competence – and followers’ outcomes. Warmth and competence are the attributes most commonly used to reflect the affective and cognitive attitude dimensions in social cognition (Fiske et al., 2007).

The second aim is to extend the study of ambivalence beyond subjective ambivalence, and to include structural attitude ambivalence. Structural ambivalence, which reflects the positive and negative reactions individuals have toward an attitude object (Kaplan, 1972; Priester & Petty, 1996; Refling et al., 2013) has two separate forms. Within-dimension ambivalence occurs when individuals hold both negative and positive evaluations of the leader on the same dimension (e.g., either their feelings or beliefs about the leader are simultaneously negative and positive). In contrast, between-dimension ambivalence occurs when individuals evaluate one dimension of the leader positively but another dimension negatively (e.g., positive feelings and negative beliefs; Bell, Esses, & Maio, 1996; MacDonald & Zanna, 1998; Thompson et al., 1995).

In my third study, leader warmth reflects the affective dimension, whereas leader competence reflects the cognitive dimension. Competence is important within organizational settings because it is at the basis of task performance (Cuddy et al., 2011; Tett & Burnett, 2003). Supporting this, individuals who were asked to make hiring decisions for a fictitious computer
lab manager consistently rated agentic applicants as more hireable than communal applicants (Rudman & Glick, 1999). The significance of warmth in organizational contexts has also been noted; employees routinely select task partners at work on the basis of interpersonal affect rather than competence (Casciaro & Lobo, 2008). Studies of physicians suggest that, even in situations where competence is critical, physicians’ warmth remains important and is a better predictor of patients’ decisions to pursue malpractice suits than competence (Sloan, Mergenhagen, Burfield, Bovbjerg, & Hassan, 1989; Taragin, Wilczek, Karns, Trout, & Carson, 1992). Both warmth and competence are important to the study of leadership; indeed, these dimensions are among the most important evaluative dimensions for leaders, as evidenced by their inclusion in 360-degree feedback programs (Zenger & Folkman, 2013; Zenger, 2018).

The interactive effects of warmth and competence have previously been examined in organizational peer-level relationships (Casciaro & Lobo, 2008), but to date have not been examined in leader-follower relationships. When leaders’ behaviours reflect inconsistent combinations of warmth and competence (e.g., high warmth/low competence or the reverse), these attributes may be considered conflicting and, therefore, result in subjective ambivalence toward leaders.

In Studies 1 and 2, subjective ambivalence mediated the relationship between inconsistent leadership and follower outcomes. In the current study, I examine if the relationship between inconsistencies on the dimensions of warmth and competence are also related to follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence. As described in Study 1, the leader-related outcomes considered in the present research include reactions and attitudes directed toward leaders (i.e., avoidance, desire to replace the leader, trust), and negative affect, an individual follower-related outcome (Schyns & Shilling, 2013). Thus:
**H1a:** The interaction of leaders’ warmth and competence will indirectly predict leader avoidance, (H1b) desire to replace the leader (H1c) cognitive trust, and (H1d) affective trust, (H1e) and negative affect through subjective ambivalence.

I include a new outcome variable in Study 3. Specifically, participants were asked to make a promotion recommendation for the leaders based on the information provided in the experimental scenario. Promotion is considered an objective and observable indicator of career success (Judge, Cable, Boudreau, & Bretz, 1995). This is especially relevant for this research, as competence, but not warmth, ratings are linked to intentions to hire, promote and educate prospective employees (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2004). However, a body of literature related to career derailment suggests that attributes related to both the competence dimension (e.g., failure to meet work objectives) and the warmth dimension (e.g., insensitivity, lack of interpersonal skills) contribute to managers’ career derailments (for a brief review see Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995), leading to my next hypothesis:

**H1f:** The interaction of leaders’ warmth and competence will indirectly predict the promotion recommendation through subjective ambivalence, such that leaders high on both warmth and competence will be more likely to receive positive promotion recommendations.

**Leader Gender**

Evaluations of leaders’ task performance (i.e., competence) and interpersonal style (i.e., warmth) may be influenced by sex-based stereotypes (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Indeed, the “ideal” attributes of leaders vary based on their gender: Women are expected to be more communal than men whereas men are expected to display more agentic qualities than women (Eagly, 1987). The potential for organizational backlash against women who fail to conform to
these expectations is high. For example, in one study, the hiring criteria for agentic women was shifted to focus on social skills versus competence, whereas competence received a higher weight for all other applicants (Phelan, Moss-Racusin, & Rudman, 2008; for a broader review of organizational backlash see Phelan & Rudman, 2010).

In addition, attitude ambivalence may be more pronounced toward leaders who deviate from prescribed social roles (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly et al., 2000). Vial, Napier, and Brescoll’s (2016) model of legitimacy suggests that evaluations of competence may be somewhat nuanced for female leaders. Their model posits that female leaders must work harder to elicit respect and admiration from followers, but that high levels of competence could lend legitimacy to women’s status as leaders (Magee & Galinsky, 2008). In contrast, indications of incompetence are expected to greatly lower female leaders’ status in the eyes of followers, especially when holding stereotype-incongruent roles (Brescoll, Dawson, & Uhlmann, 2010). Additionally, when women demonstrate their competence, they may elicit lower warmth evaluations, a phenomenon not experienced by men (Cuddy et al., 2011). As a result, I hypothesize that leaders’ gender will be salient to followers when they evaluate leaders’ warmth and competence.

The potential moderating effect of leader gender was not supported in Study 1 and gender was introduced as a control variable in Study 2. Two aspects of the current study warrant the inclusion of leaders’ gender as a moderator variable in this study. First, the scenario involves a promotion recommendation, which is relevant because female leaders are evaluated differently than male leaders (van Gils, Van Quaquebeke, Borkowski, & van Knippenberg, 2018). For example, women have to prove their credentials to a larger degree than males (Melamed, 1996), are judged more severely for errors when in gender incongruent roles (Brescoll et al., 2010), and,
in order to be promoted, need to display higher levels of performance (Landau, 1995; Ng, Eby, Sorensen, & Feldman, 2005). However, performance alone may not be sufficient for promotion because “advancement in organization depends not only on competence assessments but also on social acceptance and approval” (Heilman, 2001, p. 661). This could be particularly difficult for successful women; indeed, a great deal of interpersonal derogation is directed toward competent women who may be viewed as ‘countercommunal’, cold and selfish (for a review see Heilman, 2001). Women are permitted to be strong and sensitive, however, being strong without being sensitive results in negative evaluations for women (Johnson, et al., 2008). Male leaders need only demonstrate masculine leader behaviour, but female leaders must exhibit both masculine and feminine behaviour to be evaluated positively (Johnson et al., 2008; Heilman & Chen, 2005).

Second, the hierarchical position of the leader in the experimental scenario used in Study 3, was identified as a senior position in the organization. Upper-level management positions are typically considered to be sex-typed as male (Heilman, 2001). Accordingly, gender stereotypes could work against female leaders being seen as promotable to positions that require male characteristics such as emotional toughness (Heilman, 2001). Together these factors lead to my next hypotheses (see Figure 5):

\[ H2a \text{ to } H2f: \text{ The relationships between leader warmth and competence and follower outcomes through subjective ambivalence will be further moderated by the leaders’ gender. } \]
Structural Ambivalence

In Studies 1 and 2, subjective ambivalence (i.e., followers are aware they hold ambivalent attitudes toward their leaders) served as the mediator between inconsistent leader behaviours and a variety of outcomes including leader avoidance, a desire to replace the leader, reduced trust, negative affect and role ambiguity. In Study 3, I extend this focus and also examine the impact of structural attitude ambivalence toward leaders. Two types of structural attitude ambivalence can occur depending on the nature of the evaluative conflict. Within-dimension ambivalence reflects negative and positive evaluations about the leader on the same dimension (e.g., either feelings or beliefs about the leader are simultaneously negative and positive). In contrast, between-dimension ambivalence reflects a positive evaluation of one dimension and a negative evaluation of another dimension (e.g., positive feelings and negative beliefs; Bell et al., 1996; MacDonald & Zanna, 1998; Thompson et al., 1995).

When applied to the study of leadership, within-dimension ambivalence suggests that individuals can hold simultaneously positive and negative evaluations about their leader on either the affective (e.g., warmth) or cognitive (e.g., competence) dimension (Abele & Wojciszke,
For example, within-dimension ambivalence suggests that followers perceive their leaders as inconsistent within an evaluative dimension (e.g., perceiving a leader as both warm and cold, or competent and incompetent). In contrast to within-dimension ambivalence, between-dimension ambivalence occurs when individuals rate an attitude object favourably on one dimension (e.g., competence) but negatively on another dimension (e.g., warmth). Thus, between-dimension ambivalence stems from inconsistencies in attributes originating from different evaluative dimensions (e.g., warmth reflecting the affective dimension, competence reflecting the cognitive dimension). Gender is relevant in these evaluations. Taking one example, males who display between-dimension ambivalence toward feminists tended to simultaneously admire but dislike them, providing evidence that individuals can experience between-dimension ambivalence toward individuals and social groups (MacDonald & Zanna, 1998).

**Structural Ambivalence and Outcomes**

One way that between- and within-dimension ambivalence could differ is in their relationships with outcomes. Specifically, the outcomes associated with holding ambivalent attitudes may be different depending on the type of ambivalence experienced (Fabrigar, MacDonald, & Wegener, 2005). Supporting this idea, being treated consistently unfairly by their supervisor was less stressful for employees than being treated both fairly and unfairly, even though the mean level of fairness was higher when fairness was variable (Matta, Scott, Colquitt, Koopman, & Passanto, 2017). One interpretation of these findings is that individuals benefitted from being able to anticipate interactions with their supervisors, even when the average level of treatment was poor (Matta et al., 2017). This explanation aligns with concept of perceived control (Karasek, 1979; Sutton & Kahn, 1987). Perceived control at work is a multidimensional
construct, comprising understanding, prediction, and influence\(^9\) that can act as an antidote for organizational stress (Sutton & Kahn, 1987). Specifically, perceived control involves having knowledge about what causes important events in the workplace (i.e., understanding), the ability to “forecast the frequency, timing, duration and quality of events in one’s environment” (i.e., prediction; Sutton & Kahn, 1987, p. 274), and the capacity to impact outcomes (i.e., influence). Indeed, individuals tend to prefer their lives to be predictable, well-ordered and rational (Hogan & Shelton, 1998). In line with these ideas, within-dimension ambivalence (e.g., leaders oscillating between warmth and coldness or competence and incompetence) could leave followers with a reduced sense of control at work as they may find it more difficult to understand, predict and react to leaders’ behaviour (Côté et al., 2011; Erikson, Newman, & Pincus, 2009; Tiedens & Fragale, 2003). Indeed, when selecting between different leaders, individuals preferred leaders on whom they believed they could have some influence (Van Vugt & De Cremer, 1999). Within-dimension leader inconsistency (i.e., leaders who are both warm and cold, or competent and incompetent) is likely to be perceived negatively by followers because it makes it difficult for followers to interpret, understand (Katz-Navon et al., 2019), predict, and control future interactions (Herbert & Dunkel-Schetter, 1992; Major et al., 1997) and, thus contributes to uncertainty within the relationship.

In contrast, I posit that the inconsistency associated with between-dimension ambivalence (e.g., leader is either cold/competent or warm/incompetent) may have less of an impact on perceived control at work than within-dimension ambivalence. Specifically, leaders that vary between the dimensions of warmth and competence may be perceived as more stable over time,

\(^9\) Schat & Kelloway (2000) refer to Sutton and Kahn’s ‘control’ dimension as ‘influence’ and the three variables together as ‘control’.
thus, interactions with them may be somewhat easier to understand, predict and influence in comparison to the experience of within-dimension ambivalence (see Figure 5 for the hypothesized relationships).

Thus, I hypothesize that the followers’ levels of between- and within-dimension ambivalence toward their leaders will be related to their perceived control at work. Specifically, \( H3: \) Within-dimension and between-dimension ambivalence will differ in their relationships with \((H3a)\) understanding, \((H3b)\) prediction and \((H3c)\) influence such that within-dimension ambivalence will be most strongly related, followed by between-dimension ambivalence.

**Method**

**Participants**

434 second year psychology students recruited through a departmental participant pool completed the study and were compensated with course credit for their participation. On average, participants were 19.72 years old \((SD = 2.07; 92.6\% \text{ female})\). Hours of paid employment per week ranged from 0 to 60 hours \((M = 7.22, SD = 12.31)\).

**Experimental Procedure**

This experimental study took place online. The participants were informed that Queen’s University was considering allowing student volunteers to sit on promotion evaluation committees at the university as neutral evaluators, and that the current study was designed to examine the effectiveness of student evaluators by piloting the procedure on participants in the psychology participant pool, thereby highlighting the importance of their role and the potential impact of their evaluations. After answering demographic questions, participants were asked to read a 360-degree feedback report about a fictitious leader (Christopher/Christine Smith), which
they were led to believe was real. The equivalence of the content of the 360-degree feedback reports was pretested on the Queen’s University PSYC 100 participant pool and the report comprised two sections, one labelled Job Performance – reflecting the cognitive (i.e., competence) dimension and the other labelled Interpersonal Skills – reflecting the affective (i.e., warmth) dimension. After completing these ratings, participants completed manipulation checks, filled out numerical ratings related to the leaders, and answered questions about themselves.

Participants were assigned randomly to one of 10 possible cells, eight of which represented between-dimension ambivalence in a 2 (high/low warmth) x 2 (high/low competence) x 2 (leader gender) between-subjects design (i.e., 3 conditions with two levels of each condition). Two additional cells were included to examine within-dimension ambivalence. These cells included a mix of positive and negative statements on both the warmth and competence dimensions. All participants then read one 360-degree feedback report, which included 12 statements about the leader, 6 statements related to each of warmth and competence. Figure 6 displays an example 360-degree feedback report, see Appendix D for the remaining reports.
360 DEGREE FEEDBACK RESULTS

Christine Smith

Results generated by: Surveypros.com

---

JOB PERFORMANCE

SUPERVISOR COMMENTS
· falls short of expected performance standards
· frequently requires deadline extensions

PEER COMMENTS
· limited job knowledge
· a little passive in her work role

DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS
· doesn’t have a lot of creative ideas
· doesn’t foresee potential problems until they occur

---

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

SUPERVISOR COMMENTS
· compassionate
· sincere in her dealings

PEER COMMENTS
· a good listener
· tolerant of people’s differences

DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS
· warm in her interactions
· very helpful

---

Figure 6. 360-degree Feedback Report – Warm, Incompetent, Female Leader.

Measures

Subjective Ambivalence. As in Studies 1 and 2, subjective ambivalence toward the leader was measured with 3 items modified from Priester and Petty (1996). All scale reliabilities
are reported in Tables 15 and 21. All scales were computed so that higher values represent more of the construct.

**Structural Ambivalence.** Structural within- and between-dimension ambivalence were measured using the non-partitioned technique (Refling et al., 2013) with an adapted 28-item scale including affective and cognitive ambivalence (Crites, Fabrigar, & Petty, 1994). Participants indicated the extent to which positive and negative words describe their evaluation of the leaders described in the 360-degree feedback. Affective ambivalence was measured using five positive (friendly, warm, good-natured, sincere, helpful, $\alpha = .97$) and five negative (unfriendly, cold, irritable, insincere, moody, $\alpha = .95$) words. Cognitive ambivalence was measured with five positive (competent, capable, efficient, intelligent, knowledgeable, $\alpha = .96$) and five negative (incompetent, inept, inefficient, foolish, naïve, $\alpha = .92$) words. Responses were recorded on a scale where 1 = “not at all”, and 7 = “definitely”.

**Within-dimension Ambivalence.** Scores were computed for two indices of within-dimension ambivalence (i.e., affective and cognitive) by averaging responses to the positive items and the negative items and then mathematically combining those scores to produce indices of ambivalence based on the Gradual Threshold Model (GTM) of ambivalence using the formula:

$$A = 5C_P - D_{1/C}$$

10 Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for scales of three or more items, Spearman-Brown coefficient $\rho$ for two-item scales (Eisinga, te Grotenhuis, & Pelzer, 2012).

11 8 of these items measured Global Structural Ambivalence, but no hypotheses were made or tested on this variable.
where C is the number of conflicting reactions, D is the number of dominant reactions, P is equal to .4, and a constant of 1 is added to each C and D score (Priester & Petty, 1996). Again, higher scores represent greater structural ambivalence.

*Between-dimension Ambivalence.* To compute an index of between-dimension ambivalence, I adapted the procedure developed by Thompson et al. (1995) to the Gradual Threshold Model of Ambivalence (Priester & Petty, 1996). To express between-dimension ambivalence, participants rated one dimension positively and the other dimension negatively (or neutrally), resulting in two types of between-dimension ambivalence: leaders rated as predominantly cold and competent (e.g., negative on affective dimension and positive on competence dimension) or as warm and incompetent (e.g., positive on affective dimension and negative on competence dimension). The higher of the two terms ‘positive affective – negative affective + 1’ and ‘negative competence – positive competence + 1’ is inserted as the dominant reaction in the GTM formula and the lower value is inserted as the conflicting reaction. Individuals who rated the dimensions of warmth and competence with the same valence (e.g., both dimensions as either positive or negative) received the lowest scores on between-dimension ambivalence (values on the index ranged from -3.00 to 9.43).

**Leader Avoidance.** As in Studies 1 and 2, Côté et al.’s (2011) 3-item measure of social avoidance was used to determine the extent to which participants would avoid the leader in the scenario.

**Desire to Replace the Leader.** As in Studies 1 and 2, individuals were asked two items adapted from De Cremer (2003) that reflect how much they would like to replace the leader in the scenario with another leader.
Affect and Cognition-based Trust. As in Study 1, I used four items from McAllister’s (1995) scale in the current study.

Negative Affect. (PANAS, Watson et al., 1988). As in Study 1, participants were asked to indicate the extent they felt 10 adjectives in the current study.

Promotion Recommendation. Individuals were asked two items (e.g., “Christopher/Christine Smith is ready for promotion”) to indicate the extent to which they would recommend the individual for promotion, on a 5-point scale where 1 = “not at all”, and 5 = “very much so”.

Perceived Control. Individuals completed a six-item version of the perceived control scale (modified from Schat & Kelloway, 2000), with two items measuring each of the three dimensions (e.g., “I understand why Christopher/Christine Smith behaves as they do”; “I am able to predict Christopher/Christine Smith’s behavior”; “I could deal with challenging situations that occur with Christopher/Christine Smith at work”) rated on a 7-point response scale where 1 = “strongly disagree”, and 7 = “strongly agree”.

Manipulation Checks. To assess the degree to which individuals distinguished between the different 360-degree feedback reports which varied in their descriptions, participants were asked to identify the leaders’ gender. They also rated the leaders’ interpersonal skills (1 item representing the warmth dimension): “Based on the 360-degree evaluation feedback, please rate: The leader in the scenario’s interpersonal skills.” Finally, the rated the leaders’ job performance (representing the competence dimension): “Based on the 360-degree evaluation feedback, please
rate; the leader in the scenario’s job performance.” The response scale was 1 = “very weak”, and 5 = “very strong”.  

Data Analysis

To address my first two hypotheses in Study 3, which constituted tests of moderated moderated mediation, I used a similar analysis approach to that fully described in the Data Analysis section for Study 1. I estimated a series of linear regression equations in which each dependent variable (e.g., leader avoidance, desire to replace leader, cognitive and affective trust, negative affect and promotion recommendation) was considered in a separate analysis, with subjective ambivalence as the mediator, competence as the independent variable, and warmth and leader gender as the moderators (see Figure 5 for the hypothesized model). Following Hayes (2018b), I examined the index of moderated moderated mediation. Moderated moderated mediation is evidenced when the index was significantly different from zero. In those instances, it was appropriate to examine the conditional moderated indirect effects of competence on each outcome at lower and higher levels of the moderators.

Hypothesis 3 focused on structural within- and between-dimension ambivalence. I conducted a one-way ANOVA to determine if the assigned condition and level (a multi-categorical IV) predicted within- and between-dimension ambivalence (DVs) in the hypothesized direction. As described in the methods section, two indices were calculated for within-dimension ambivalence (i.e., affective and cognitive) and one index was computed for between-dimension ambivalence, which included both leaders rated as cold/competent and warm/incompetent. To test Hypothesis 3, I conducted a one-way ANOVA to determine if those in the within- and
between-dimension ambivalence cells experienced lower levels of perceived control at work (e.g., understanding, prediction and influence), with those in the within-dimension ambivalence cells experiencing the lowest levels across the three facets of perceived control, followed by between-dimension ambivalence and the control cells.

Results

Descriptive statistics, zero-order correlations and reliabilities for all scales used in Hypotheses 1 to 3 are presented in Table 15, and those related to Hypothesis 4 are in Table 16.
Table 15

Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations and Scale Reliabilities (Study 3; N = 321-329)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SA</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AL</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>(.85)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RL</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CT</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>(.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AT</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. NA</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PR</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. UN</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PRE</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. IN</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>(.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Reliabilities are on the diagonal in parentheses. SA = Subjective Ambivalence, AL = Avoid Leader, RL = Replace Leader, CT = Cognitive Trust, AT = Affective Trust, NA = Negative Affect, PA = Positive Affect, PR = Promotion Recommendation, UN = Understanding, PRE = Prediction, IN = Influence. All \( r < .11, p > .05; r \leq .12 \text{ and } .14, p < .05; r \geq .15, p < .01 \)

Table 16

Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations and Scale Reliabilities for Within- and Between-Dimension Ambivalence (Study 3; N = 318-329)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Within-Dimension: Affective</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Within- Dimension: Cognitive</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Between-Dimension</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All \( r \leq .04, p > .05; r \geq .16, p < .01 \)
Manipulation Checks

Before testing the hypotheses, I checked the validity of the manipulations. For the leader gender manipulation, 77% of participants classified the target gender correctly (332/434); only individuals who accurately classified the leaders’ gender were retained for subsequent analyses. Using G*Power, I conducted a sensitivity analysis based on the final sample size, the minimum effect size that this experiment had 80% power to detect was .224. For the warm vs. cold manipulation, ratings of interpersonal skills were significantly higher in the warm scenarios (M = 3.96, SD = .85) than those in the mixed (M = 2.40, SD = .90) and cold scenarios (M = 1.88, SD = .90; F(2, 329) = 197.05, p < .001, η2 = .545). Likewise, with respect to the competence manipulation, ratings of job performance were significantly higher in the high competence (M = 3.92, SD = .919) than those in the mixed (M = 3.09, SD = .765) and incompetent scenarios (M = 2.01, SD = .957; F(2, 329) = 148.63, p < .001, η2 = .475). For both warmth and competence, Games-Howell and Dunnets’ C (two-sided) post hoc tests confirmed the means of all groups were significantly different from each other (ps < .05).

Hypotheses Testing

Subjective Ambivalence: Tests of Moderated Moderated Mediation.

To test hypotheses 1a to 2f, I considered the cells that constituted the 2 x 2 x 2 design (warm/cold; competent/incompetent; male/female) and excluded the 2 additional cells that represented mixed warm/cold and competent/incompetent by gender.13 Supporting hypotheses 1a, there was a significant two-way interaction between warmth and competence predicting subjective ambivalence, (b = -4.381, CI [- 5.321, -3.443]).

13 For ease, the warm/cold dimension is referred to as warmth and the competent/incompetent dimension is referred to as competence.
I then extended the analysis to assess the moderating role of gender. Hypothesis 2a was also supported, the 3-way interaction between competence, warmth and gender predicted leader avoidance through the mediating effects of subjective ambivalence, supporting H2a. Specifically, the indirect effects of competence on leader avoidance through subjective ambivalence was dependent on warmth and gender. The associated index of moderated moderated mediation was significant ($b = -.167$, CI [-.407, -.004]). The pattern of results associated with indirect effect of competence on leader avoidance through subjective ambivalence is the same across gender, however, the findings are more pronounced for female leaders in both the warm and cold cells. Specifically, the larger coefficients associated with female leaders in both the warm and cold cells suggest that the interaction effects of warmth and competence are stronger for female (vs male) leaders (see Table 17). Figure 7 displays the interaction between warmth and competence predicting subjective ambivalence for male and female leaders.

![Figure 7](image)

*Figure 7. Interaction of Warmth and Competence predicting Subjective Ambivalence toward Male and Female Leaders in Study 3.*

Because gender moderated the relationship between competence, warmth and subjective ambivalence, H1b to H2f were tested simultaneously.
Table 17

*Conditional Indirect Effect of Competence on Leader Avoidance through Subjective Ambivalence with Warmth and Leader Gender as Moderators (Study 3; N = 262)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>Leader Avoidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>(.237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence x Warmth x Gender</td>
<td>-2.105</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td>-.443</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar pattern of results was obtained for the desire to replace the leader (H2b; see Table 18), affective trust (H2d; see Table 19), negative affect (H2e; see Table 20) and promotion recommendation (H2f; see Table 21). Together, these analyses indicate that the indirect effect of competence on outcomes through subjective ambivalence was more pronounced for female leaders in both the warm and cold cells. Specifically, the unstandardized bs for female leaders were all larger than the unstandardized bs for male leaders (see Tables 18 to 21). Thus, inconsistencies between dimensions for female leaders resulted in higher ratings of subjective ambivalence (for both cold/competent or warm/incompetent combinations), however, ratings of
subjective ambivalence were lower for female leaders depicted as consistent (warm/competent and cold/incompetent).
Table 18

*Conditional Indirect Effect of Competence on Desire to Replace Leader through Subjective Ambivalence with Warmth and Leader Gender as Moderators (Study 3; N = 263)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>Desire to Replace Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence x Warmth x Gender</td>
<td>-2.262</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>-.398</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td>- .587</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td>-.984</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-.457</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Conditional Indirect Effect of Competence on Affective Trust through Subjective Ambivalence with Warmth and Leader Gender as Moderators (Study 3; N = 263)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>Affective Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence x Warmth x</td>
<td>-2.262</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>-0.0186</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: Index of Conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderated Mediation by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>-.373</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: Index of Conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderated Mediation by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-.557</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

*Conditional Indirect Effect of Competence on Negative Affect through Subjective Ambivalence with Warmth and Leader Gender as Moderators (Study 3; N = 264)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LLCI</td>
<td>ULCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>1.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.334</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>-.808</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence x Warmth x Gender</td>
<td>-2.205</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>-4.090</td>
<td>-.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-1.326</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>-2.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>2.941</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>2.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-2.600</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>-3.587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

*Conditional Indirect Effect of Competence on Promotion Recommendation through Subjective Ambivalence with Warmth and Leader Gender as Moderators (Study 3; N = 258)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>Promotion Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence x Warmth x Gender</td>
<td>-2.090</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Moderated Mediation</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, one hypothesized relationship was not supported by the proposed model. Specifically, the 3-way interaction of competence, warmth and gender did not predict cognitive trust through subjective ambivalence (H2c; see Table 22). Subjective ambivalence was not related to cognitive trust, the associated index of moderated moderated mediation contained zero ($b = .061$, CI $[-.109, .285]$).
Table 22

**Conditional Indirect Effect of Competence on Cognitive Trust through Subjective Ambivalence with Warmth and Leader Gender as Moderators (Study 3; N = 263)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Subjective Ambivalence</th>
<th>Cognitive Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.322</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence x Warmth x Gender</td>
<td>-2.262</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Moderated Moderated Mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females: Index of Conditional Moderated Mediation by Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structural Ambivalence**

Hypotheses 3a to 3c were focused on structural within- and between-dimension ambivalence. The cells designed to promote within-dimension ambivalence described the leader as simultaneously warm/cold and competent/incompetent. The cells designed to promote between-dimension ambivalence included statements that described the leader as either warm/incompetent or cold/competent. Finally, the control cells described leaders that were either warm/competent or cold/incompetent. Table 23 displays the expected type of ambivalence for followers (i.e., between-dimension, within-dimension, control) based on assigned condition and level.
Table 23

Experimental Conditions and Levels for Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Affective Dimension</th>
<th>Cognitive Dimension</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Predicted Ambivalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Between-dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Between-dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Within-dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Between-dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Between-dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Within-dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to testing Hypotheses 3a to 3c, I first conducted a one-way ANOVA that examined within- and between-dimension ambivalence based on the type of leader inconsistency presented to ensure that the scenarios appropriated differentiated the types of ambivalence hypothesized. The participants in the between-dimension cells were significantly more likely to have higher scores on the index representing between-dimension ambivalence ($M = 2.37$, $SD = .323$) than those in the within-dimension ($M = -.180$, $SD = .462$) and control cells ($M = -1.99$, $SD = .326$; $F(2, 316) = 45.40$, $\eta^2 = .223$, $p < .001$), demonstrating the ambivalence ratings were congruent with the scenarios.
Different patterns were noted for the two indices related to within-dimension ambivalence (i.e., affective and cognitive). For within-dimension affective ambivalence the within-dimension cells differed from the between-dimension and control cells, which did not differ from one another (within-dimension $M = 6.84, SD = .181$; between-dimension $M = 5.74, SD = .127$; and control $M = 5.59, SD = .127$; $F(2, 320) = 17.28, \eta^2 = .097, p < .001$).

However, for within-dimension cognitive ambivalence, the within- and between cells differed significantly from the control cells but not each other (between-dimension $M = 6.61, SD = .127$; within-dimension $M = 6.99, SD = .182$; and control $M = 5.77, SD = .127$; $F(2, 319) = 18.83, \eta^2 = .106, p < .001$). Dunnett’s C post hoc tests were conducted, supporting the differences reported above.

To provide a test of the hypothesis that within-dimension and between-dimension ambivalence would differ in their relationships with perceived control at work (Hypotheses 3a to c), I conducted a 2 (gender) x 3 (predicted ambivalence: within-dimension, between-dimension, control) between-subjects ANOVA. I posited that within- and between-dimension ambivalence would differ in their relationships with understanding, prediction and influence such that those in the within-dimension ambivalence cells would express the lowest amounts of control at work (e.g., understanding, prediction and influence) followed by between-dimension ambivalence and the control cells. No directional hypotheses were proposed based upon leader gender. Supporting H3a, participants in the within-dimension cells expressed less understanding of their leaders’ behaviour than those in between-dimension and control cells, which did not differ from one another (within-dimension $M = 3.46, SD = .167$; between-dimension $M = 4.04 SD = .117$; and control $M = 4.03, SD = .117$; $F(2, 326) = 4.676, p = .010$) $\eta^2 = .028$; these results did not differ by gender $F(1, 327) = .827, p = .364$. 


Similarly, participants in the within-dimension cells expressed less ability to predict leaders’ behaviour than those in between-dimension and control cells, which did not differ from one another (within-dimension $M = 3.90$, $SD = .157$; between-dimension $M = 4.60$ $SD = .110$; and control $M = 4.89$, $SD = .110$; $F(2, 326) = 13.615$, $\eta^2 = .078$, $p < .001$), these results did not differ by gender $F(1, 327) = .014$, $p = .907$, supporting H3b.

Finally, the within-dimension cells expressed less ability to influence leaders than those in control cells but did not differ from those in the between-dimension cells (within-dimension $M = 4.39$, $SD = .135$; control $M = 4.89$, $SD = .095$; and between-dimension $M = 4.50$ $SD = .095$; $F(2, 325) = 6.171$, $\eta^2 = .037$, $p = .002$), these results did not differ by gender $F(1, 326) = .066$, $p = .797$, offering partial support for H3c. Dunnett’s T post hoc tests were conducted, supporting the differences reported above. Figure 8 displays the results of H3a to 3c.
Figure 8. Relationships Between Ambivalence, Understanding, Prediction and Influence: Study 3, Part 2.

Discussion

Study 3 examined different inconsistencies across leader warmth and competence using an experimental design, in which students were asked to evaluate leaders for promotion based on 360-degree feedback forms that manipulated leader attributes of warmth (e.g., interpersonal skills), competence (e.g., technical skills) and gender. The results of the moderated moderated mediation analyses replicated the findings of Studies 1 and 2.

I also extended previous findings in three ways. First, unique to Study 3, leaders’ gender was an important moderating variable. The relationships between combinations of competence, warmth and gender (i.e., warm/incompetent or cold/competent) were indirectly related to all outcomes (with the exception of cognitive trust) through ratings of subjective ambivalence. The pattern of results associated with indirect effect of competence on leader avoidance through
subjective ambivalence is the same across gender, however, the findings are more pronounced for female leaders in both the warm and cold cells. Specifically, the interaction effects of warmth and competence are stronger for female (vs male) leaders. In one respect, this finding reinforces Johnson et al.’s (2008) assertion that female leaders are allowed to be strong and sensitive, however, being strong without being sensitive results in negative evaluations for women. However, this finding also introduces an inconsistency not previously examined, because being evaluated as warm but incompetent lead to the highest levels of ambivalence in this study, for both male and female leaders. This may, in part, be explained by the promotion scenario, where leaders’ competence was likely highly salient to raters (Cuddy et al., 2004).

The additional outcome examined in this study, making a promotion recommendation for the leaders based on the information provided in the experimental scenario, also represents an extension to Studies 1 and 2. Promotion is an observable, objective indication of career success (Judge et al., 1995). The findings of the current study suggest that the interaction of competence and warmth ratings are linked to intentions to promote prospective employees, extending previous research (e.g., Cuddy et al., 2004).

Finally, Study 3 made a third contribution by examining the effects of inconsistencies between leader warmth and competence on structural ambivalence. Within- and between-dimension ambivalence were related to perceived control at work (i.e., understanding, prediction and influence) differently. As hypothesized, participants in the within-dimension ambivalence cells expressed less understanding of, and less ability to predict their leaders’ behaviour than those in between-dimension and control cells. However, with respect to the ability to influence leaders, the within- and between-dimension cells did not differ from each other, but differed from the control cells, suggesting that leader inconsistencies are viewed by followers as difficult
to influence, regardless of the type of inconsistency. There were no significant differences based on gender.

One outcome did not conform to the hypothesized moderated moderated mediation model. Specifically, the indirect effects of competence on cognitive trust through subjective ambivalence were not dependent on either warmth or gender. One possible explanation for this is that cognitive trust would be based more strongly on the cognitive dimension (i.e., competence) and was less impacted by the affective dimension (i.e., warmth) and gender.

**Strengths and Limitations**

Study 3 conceptually extends my prior two studies in several ways. First, this research used a different operationalization of leader inconsistency on the dimensions of warmth and competence. Second, Study 3 provides evidence of an instance where leader gender influences the relationship between leader inconsistencies and follower outcomes. The current research broadened the scope of ambivalence examined to include both subjective and structural ambivalence. Finally, this study provides further evidence that subjective ambivalence is an important mediator between leader inconsistency and follower outcomes. Methodologically, the use of a between-subjects randomized experimental design allows for causal inferences. However, using an experimental promotion scenario could pose some limitations because individuals’ responses in the experimental setting might not reflect their responses in a field setting (Burton et al., 2011). Similarly, using an undergraduate population might reduce the generalizability of the present findings. However, results tend to replicate between student and field samples in leadership research (e.g., Lee et al., 2017; van Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005) and the lack of ability to generalize beyond student populations may be overestimated (Brown & Lord, 1999).
Future Research Directions

Although others have also used warmth and competence categories when studying leadership (Zenger, 2018; Zenger & Folkman, 2013), it is possible that the way competence was operationalized in this study did not convey the full range of the cognitive evaluative dimension for leaders because this dimension can also include variables such as agency and respect (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). Future research could examine other operationalizations of the cognitive evaluative dimension using descriptions based upon agency. This is particularly important because role congruity theory asserts that men are expected to display more agentic qualities than women and the reactions to women who display agentic qualities may be ambivalence (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Thus, more pronounced gender differences might be revealed using a different operationalization of the cognitive dimension based on agency.

In addition, the sample was predominantly female, which could have also influenced the results by either inflating or reducing relationships. The available evidence regarding gender differences in leadership ratings is mixed. For example, meta-analyses show that gender-unbalanced rater groups tend to evaluate male and female leaders differently (gender differences tend to be smaller in gender-balanced groups; Paustian-Underdahl, Walker, & Woehr, 2014). When rating leader effectiveness, female leaders evaluated by female raters are seen as more effective than male leaders, whereas in male rater groups, men are not evaluated as more effective leaders than women (Paustian-Underdahl et al., 2014). However, gender-based stereotypes typically function to the disadvantage of women (Maher, 1997). In the leadership domain, the impact of gender-based stereotypes can be even more pronounced when ratings are provided by male evaluators (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Alternately, female subordinates may expect female leaders to be more relationship-oriented to align with feminine
values (Druskat, 1994; Russell, Rush, & Herd, 1988) and younger women (i.e., undergraduates) expect female leaders to also exhibit higher levels of initiating structure, role assumption and production emphasis than older, more experienced women (Russell et al., 1988). Thus, future research with a more representative sample (i.e., balanced by gender) is needed.

**Conclusion**

Study 3 represents a novel integration of gender, leadership attributes and behaviours in exploring leader inconsistency. In addition to providing further support to the hypothesized conditional indirect effects model (see Figure 5) by operationalizing a different form of leader inconsistency, Study 3 identified leader gender as a variable that influences the evaluation of inconsistent leaders. Study 3 also extended the findings of Studies 1 and 2 by illuminating the importance of considering structural ambivalence in relation to perceived control at work. In particular, this research is important because it begins to explain the interplay of gender in the context of inconsistent leadership.
Chapter 5:

General Discussion

Leaders’ behaviours are not always consistent (e.g., Johnson et al., 2012; Lin et al., 2016), and leader inconsistency can result in negative consequences for followers (e.g., Duffy et al., 2002; Hobman et al., 2009; Mullen et al., 2018; Nahum-Shani et al., 2014). The overarching goal of my research was to advance our understanding about one mechanism that drives this negative effect, namely subjective ambivalence. Across three studies, I was able to isolate the role of subjective ambivalence as one mechanism between leader inconsistency and follower outcomes (Podsakoff & Podsakoff, 2019).

Based on the work stress framework (Pratt & Barling, 1998), which posits that work stressors (or events) become stressful when they are appraised as such, I proposed that subjective ambivalence would mediate the relationship between leader inconsistency and follower outcomes. As operationalized in this research, subjective ambivalence represents a situation where followers are aware they hold ambivalent attitudes toward their leaders (i.e., they feel conflicted, have mixed reactions, or are indecisive regarding their leader). The results of Studies 1 and 2 revealed that when followers observe abusive supervision in conjunction with transformational leadership they react with subjective ambivalence toward their leaders. Study 3 produced a similar pattern of findings using the dimensions of warmth and competence to represent leader inconsistency. However, using a cross-sectional design in Study 2, two hypothesized forms of inconsistent leadership did not produce subjective ambivalence in followers (i.e., reward and punishment omission in conjunction with transformational leadership), and this was explained in terms of the less visible nature of passive leadership in contrast to the overt nature of abusive supervision.
In Study 3, the effect of leader inconsistency was more pronounced for female leaders. This finding reinforces Johnson et al.’s assertion that women are allowed to be strong and sensitive, however, being strong without being sensitive results in negative evaluations for women (Johnson, et al., 2008).

**Conceptual Implications**

This program of research has several conceptual implications. First, it also contributes to the nascent literature challenging the notion that leaders conform to one leadership style and do not stray from it. Second, it expands upon the existing leadership literature by simultaneously examining positive and negative leader behaviours and attributes, thereby responding to the call for more research examining the interactive effects of different leadership behaviours in Studies 1 and 2 (Hannah et al., 2014) and also considering leader attributes in Study 3 (DeRue et al., 2011). Finally, it identified subjective ambivalence as a mechanism that drives the relationship between several types of leader inconsistencies and follower outcomes.

In this research, ambivalence was detrimental to followers, which aligns with Lee et al.’s (2017) and other’s research that identifies negative health implications of ambivalent relationships (e.g., Herr et al., 2019; Uchino, Smith & Berg, 2014). However, some research notes beneficial effects of ambivalence – for example, when it promotes openness and flexibility (e.g., Ashforth et al., 2014). It is also possible that some individuals and work contexts may evidence a lower tolerance for ambiguity (Furnham & Ribchester, 1995), which may influence the impact of leader inconsistency on followers.

**Practical Implications**

The current findings suggest that effective leadership training may involve more than just teaching leaders what behaviours to perform, but also encouraging them to enact positive
leadership behaviours consistently (Johnson et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2017). Leadership training programs or targeted interventions could also encourage leaders to be clear in their cues and directions to reduce the chance for ambiguity in followers and enhance their ability to understand and predict leaders’ messages (Katz-Navon et al., 2019).

In Study 3, the identical 360-degree feedback evaluation reports produced different levels of ambivalence toward male and female leaders, aligning with other research that indicates the same behaviours are construed differently for males and females (e.g., Heilman & Chen, 2005; Heilman & Haynes, 2005). This could have implications for female leaders, particularly those who display lower levels of warmth in conjunction with high competence. Thus, it is important that organizations provide information about the lack of actual gender-based differences in leader effectiveness to individuals serving on promotion and selection committees to ensure stereotype-based biases are minimized in these contexts (Eagly et al., 1995; Heilman & Haynes, 2005; Morgan, Walker, Hebl, & King, 2013).

**Future Research Directions**

Having demonstrated that leader inconsistency has direct and indirect negative effects, one question that emerges is just how much inconsistency is necessary for those negative effects to emerge. Event sampling or daily diary studies could help determine how much leader inconsistency is required before it is evaluated negatively by followers and exerts a negative impact.

Indeed, future research using other methods (e.g., experimental or longitudinal designs) might also be able to determine the types of passive leadership and the circumstances under which passive leadership in conjunction with other leader behaviour influences followers’ evaluative conflict. For example, passive avoidant leader behaviours (Avolio et al., 1999) might
send a message that leaders do not care for their followers and will not invest resources in them (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). On the other hand, reward and punishment omission behaviours are focused on reinforcement (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008) and may not be perceived as negatively. Specifically, punishment omission, although conceptualized as a negative form of non-leadership, may be perceived more positively by followers because they do not want to be punished when things go wrong.

Future research could also extend my findings by identifying and examining other potential mediating variables likely to influence the relationship between inconsistent leadership and follower outcomes. For example, attributions made about why leaders enact inconsistent behaviours could impact followers’ outcomes. The types of attributions made for supervisors’ abusive behaviours influence the behavioural responses of subordinates. For example, depending if individuals believe that leaders act in an abusive manner for performance-promotion versus injury-initiation motives, the impact of abusive supervision on follower outcomes may either be augmented or attenuated (Liu Liao, & Loi, 2012). Therefore, future research should also examine how attributions about leaders’ inconsistent behaviours are related to employee outcomes (e.g., well-being, performance, and job attitudes). Additionally, variables such as followers’ daily stress (e.g., Matta et al., 2017) or negative affect (e.g., Lee et al., 2017) represent other potential mediating variables that are worthy of consideration in future research. Similarly, leaders’ perceived instability (e.g., interpersonal spin; Côté et al., 2011) may represent a possible mediating process that could account for followers’ negative evaluations that are not explained by ambivalence and is, therefore, worthy of future research.

In order to develop effective leadership training that promotes consistent and positive leadership behaviours, a greater understanding as to why leader inconsistency occurs in the first
place would be beneficial. To date, several concepts have been considered in this regard. For example, previous research has shown that middle-level managers tend to use their own supervisors as role models for leadership behaviour (social learning; Bandura, 1977; 1986). This trickle-down impact has been shown in relation to abusive supervision and may be also relevant in terms of inconsistent behaviour (Liu, et al., 2012). In addition, several variables that can contribute to inconsistency have been identified at the individual-leader level including ego depletion, lack of self-control, the accumulation of moral credits and leader identity. Specifically, the association between ethical leadership one day and abusive supervision the next day was mediated by ego depletion and moral credits (Lin et al., 2016). Leader identity was also identified as an antecedent to the degree of consistency in enacting transformational, consideration and abusive leadership behaviours (Johnson et al., 2012).

Broadly, individuals who are distressed display more variable interpersonal behaviour (Erickson et al., 2009). More specifically, supervisors with more self-control tended to be less variable in their fair treatment over time (Matta et al., 2017). Variables such as reduced sleep quality and quantity are associated with reduced self-regulation (Barnes, 2012), and could potentially contribute to leaders’ ability to act consistently. Paying attention to the psychological well-being of leaders could potentially have a beneficial impact on their followers (see also Barling & Cloutier, 2017). Thus, considering the factors that influence leaders’ ability to act consistently might be a fruitful area for future research.

The indirect effects of leaders’ inconsistency could be exacerbated or ameliorated under certain conditions. One possible individual difference variable that could influence these indirect effects is followers’ self-esteem. Indeed, previous research has shown that leadership inconsistencies are more detrimental to followers low in social self-esteem (De Cremer, 2003).
and global self-esteem (Nahum-Shani et al., 2014). Examining whether some followers may be more susceptible to evaluative conflict is worthy of further study. In addition, other contextual variables such as a lower tolerance for ambiguity (Furnham & Ribchester, 1995), may be important considerations in terms of perceptions of and reactions to inconsistent leadership.

**Conclusion**

Across three studies using different methodologies (two experimental studies in conjunction with a cross-sectional survey), different samples (employees of organizations and students) and different operationalizations of leader inconsistency (i.e., leader behaviours and leader attributes), leader inconsistency had negative effects on follower outcomes through a mediator - subjective ambivalence. These findings are important because leadership research tends to assume that leaders are consistent in the leadership behaviours they enact, as is evidenced by the frequent reference to leadership “styles”. My research contributes to a growing body of knowledge that questions this proposition and provides one explanation for how leaders’ inconsistencies indirectly affect follower well-being and work attitudes.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Study 1 Conditions and Vignettes

Table 24

*Experimental Conditions and Levels for Study 1.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Abusive Supervision</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vignette Instructions: Please read the following scenario and do your best to consider how you would think, feel and act in the situation described below.

*Absent Transformational Leadership/ Present Abusive Supervision*

You work for a top software design company that underwent a major downsizing about a year ago. Since the layoffs, employees at all levels of the organization have had extremely heavy workloads and many additional responsibilities. Deadlines have become impossible to meet. You have increasingly found it difficult to complete all of your own projects on time. Your boss, Alex Clark, reacts with hostility any time you request a deadline extension. (S)He speaks to you
rudely and has repeatedly criticized you in front of your colleagues. You have also seen her/him yelling and belittling her/his other employees.

Present Transformational Leadership/Absent Abusive Supervision

You work for a top software design company that underwent a major downsizing about a year ago. Since the layoffs, employees at all levels of the organization has had extremely heavy workloads and many additional responsibilities. Deadlines have become impossible to meet. You have increasingly found it difficult to complete all of your projects on time. Your boss, Alex Clark, routinely motivates you to meet demanding deadlines by sharing her/his vision for your team. (S)He is always polite and has repeatedly praised your efforts in front of your colleagues. You have also seen her/him encouraging and providing one on one coaching to her/his other employees.

Present Transformational Leadership/Present Abusive Supervision

You work for a top software design company that underwent a major downsizing about a year ago. Since the layoffs, employees at all levels of the organization has had extremely heavy workloads and many additional responsibilities. Deadlines have become impossible to meet. You have increasingly found it difficult to complete all of your projects on time. You don’t know how your boss, Alex Clark, will react when you request a deadline extension. At times (s)he motivates you to meet demanding deadlines by sharing her/his vision for the team with you. But (s)he also sometimes reacts with hostility, speaking rudely and criticizing. Despite this negativity, (s)he has repeatedly praised your efforts in front of your colleagues. Within the same day, you have seen her/him yell at and belittle one employee and then provide coaching to another staff member.

Absent Transformational Leadership/Absent Abusive Supervision
You work for a top software design company that underwent a major downsizing about a year ago. Since the layoffs, employees at all levels of the organization have had extremely heavy workloads and many additional responsibilities. Deadlines have become impossible to meet. You have increasingly found it difficult to complete all of your projects on time. Your boss, Alex Clark, doesn’t respond when you request a deadline extension. Routinely, (s)he ignores your emails and requests for meetings. Whether you succeed or fail on a project (s)he does nothing. You know (s)he also acts this way with her/his other employees.
Appendix B: Study 1 Measures

Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

Participant Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please select the response that reflects your agreement.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

1. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times, I think I am no good at all (reverse scored)
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (reverse scored)
6. I certainly feel useless at times. (reverse scored)
7. I feel that I’m a person of worth.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. (reverse scored)
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (reverse scored)
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Implicit Leadership Theories (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994)

Participant Instructions: How characteristic is each of the following traits of a business leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all characteristic</th>
<th>Extremely characteristic</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding
Sincere
Helpful
Intelligent
Clever
Knowledgeable
Educated
Motivated
Dedicated
Hard-working
Dynamic
Strong
Energetic
Domineering
Pushy
Manipulative
Loud
Conceited
Selfish
Male
Masculine

Other Measures:

Demographic Information

What is your gender__________

How many hours per week do you work for paid employment?______

Structural Ambivalence Adapted from Crites, Fabrigar and Petty (1994)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which the following words apply to Alex/Alexa Clark:

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale Items:

Global evaluation (positive)
1. Good
2. Likeable
3. Positive
4. Satisfactory

Global evaluation (negative)
1. Bad
2. Dislikeable
3. Negative
4. Unsatisfactory

Warm (Affective Dimension)
1. Friendly
2. Warm
3. Good natured
4. Sincere
5. Understanding

_Cold (Affective Dimension)_
1. Unfriendly
2. Cold
3. Irritable
4. Insincere
5. Moody

_Competence (Cognitive Dimension)_
1. Competent
2. Capable
3. Efficient
4. Intelligent
5. Knowledgeable

_Incompetence (Cognitive Dimension)_
1. Incompetent
2. Inept
3. Inefficient
4. Foolish
5. Naïve

**Subjective ambivalence** Modified from Priester and Petty (1996).

Scale Items and Response Scales:

1. How conflicted do you feel toward Alex/Alexa Clark?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel no conflict at all</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. How much indecisiveness do you feel toward Alex/Alexa Clark?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel no indecision at all</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
3. Do you have mixed reactions toward Alex/Alexa Clark?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely one-sided reactions</th>
<th>Completely mixed reactions</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perceived Control** (Modified from Schat & Kelloway, 2000)

Participant Instructions: For this section, please imagine that you work for Alex/Alexa Clark and indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

*Understanding*
1. I understand why Alex/Alexa Clark behaves as they do
2. I know why interactions with Alex/Alexa Clark occur

*Prediction*
1. I am able to predict the behavior of Alex/Alexa Clark.
2. I am able to predict how Alex/Alexa Clark will treat me.

*Influence*
1. I could prevent negative interactions with Alex/Alexa Clark from happening.
2. I could deal with challenging situations that occur with Alex/Alexa Clark at work.

*Outcomes*

**Trust** McAllister’s (1995) scale modified to fit the vignettes.

Participant Instructions: Please imagine you work for Alex/Alexa Clark and indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Response Scale:
Scale Items:

**Affect-based trust**
1. I could talk freely to Alex/Alexa Clark about difficulties I was having at work and know that he/she would want to listen
2. If I shared my problems with Alex/Alexa Clark, I know he/she would respond constructively and caringly.

**Cognition-based trust**
1. Alex/Alexa Clark approaches the job with professionalism and dedication
2. I could rely on Alex/ALEXA Clark not to make my job more difficult by careless work.

**Avoidance of Leader** (Modified from Côté, Moskowitz, and Zuroff, 2011)
Participant Instructions: For this section, please imagine that you work for Alex/Alexa Clark and indicate your response to the following statements.

Response Scale:

| Very little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | A great deal | 6 | 7 | Prefer not to answer | 9 |

Scale Items:

1. I avoided him/her
2. I ignored him/her
3. I did not make an effort to include him/her in a conversation

**Replacing the Leader** (Modified from De Cremer, 2003)
Participant Instructions: For this section, please imagine that you work for Alex/Alexa Clark and indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Response Scale:

| Not at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Prefer not to answer | 9 |
1. How much you would like to replace Alex/Alexa Clark with another leader.
2. To what extent would you like to replace Alex/Alexa Clark with a different leader?

**Positive and Negative Affect Schedule** (PANAS, Watson et al., 1988)

Participant Instructions: This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer to indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, in the present moment.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:
interested
distressed
excited
upset
strong
guilty
scared
hostile
enthusiastic
proud
irritable
alert
ashamed
inspired
nervous
determined
attentive
jittery
active
afraid
Manipulation Checks

1. To what extent is the supervisor’s behavior in the scenario consistent?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all consistent</th>
<th>Somewhat consistent</th>
<th>Very consistent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What gender was the individual in the scenario you read?

Male

Female

**Abusive Supervision** (Tepper, 2000) (Shortened version – Mitchell & Ambrose, 2007)

Participant Instructions: Please answer the following questions about the supervisor in the scenario.

Response Scale:

| Strongly Disagree | | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1                 | 2               | 3               | 4               | 5               | 6               | 7               |

Scale Items:

This supervisor …
1. ridicules employees.
2. tells employees their thoughts or feelings are stupid.
3. puts employees down in front of others.
4. makes negative comments about employees to others.
5. tells employees they are incompetent.

**Transformational Leadership.** (a shortened 5-item version of Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990 to match the study vignettes)

Participant Instructions: Please answer the following questions about Alex Clark.

Response Scale:

| Strongly Disagree | | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1                 | 2               | 3               | 4               | 5               | 6               | 7               |
Scale Items:

This supervisor …
1. inspires others with their plans for the future.
2. fosters collaboration among work groups.
3. leads by “doing” rather than simply by “telling.”
4. shows respect for personal feelings.
5. provides a good model to follow.
Appendix C: Study 2 Measures

Demographic Information

Please indicate your gender __________

Please enter your age (in years) __________

Please indicate your leader’s gender__________

How long have you worked for this leader? (______years______ months)

Abusive Supervision (Tepper, 2000)

Participant Instructions: Please answer the following questions based on your leader.

Response Scale:

<p>| Scale Items: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I cannot remember him/her ever using this behavior with me.</th>
<th>He/she very seldom uses this behavior with me.</th>
<th>He/she occasionally uses this behavior with me.</th>
<th>He/she uses this behavior moderately with me.</th>
<th>He/she uses this behavior very often with me.</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

My leader…
1. Ridicules me.
2. Tells me my thoughts or feelings are stupid.
4. Puts me down in front of others.
5. Invades my privacy.
6. Reminds me of my past mistakes and failures.
7. Doesn’t give me credit for jobs requiring a lot of effort.
8. Blames me to save himself/herself embarrassment.
9. Breaks promises he/she makes.
10. Expresses anger at me when he/she is mad for another reason.
11. Makes negative comments about me to others.
12. Is rude to me.
13. Does not allow me to interact with my coworkers.
14. Tells me I’m incompetent.
15. Lies to me.

Passive Leadership (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008)
Participant Instructions: Please answer the following questions in reference to your leader.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

*Reward Omission*
1. I often perform well in my job and still receive no praise from my manager.
2. When I perform well my manager usually does nothing.
3. My good performance often goes unacknowledged by my manager.
4. I don’t often get praised by my manager when I perform well.

*Punishment Omission*
1. My manager gives me no feedback when I perform poorly.
2. When I perform poorly in my job I receive no criticism from my manager.
3. When I perform poorly my manager does nothing.
4. My poor performance often gets no response from my manager.


Participant Instructions: This questionnaire describes your own manager’s leadership style.

Please rate the following items about your leader.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

My leader…

1. Is always seeking new opportunities for the unit/department/organization.
2. Paints an interesting picture of the future for our group.
3. Has a clear understanding of where we are going.
4. Inspires others with his/her plans for the future.
5. Is able to get others committed to his/her dream of the future.
6. Fosters collaboration among work groups.
7. Encourages employees to be “team players.”
8. Gets the group to work together for the same goal.
9. Develops a team attitude and spirit among his/her employees.
10. Acts without considering my feelings (reverse coded).
11. Shows respect for my personal feelings.
12. Behaves in a manner that is thoughtful of my personal needs.
13. Treats me without considering my personal feelings (reverse coded)
14. Shows us that he/she expects a lot from us.
15. Insists on only the best performance.
17. Leads by “doing” rather than simply by “telling.”
18. Provides a good model to follow.
19. Leads by example.
20. Has provided me with new ways of looking at things which used to be a puzzle for me.
21. Has ideas that have forced me to rethink some of my own ideas I have never questioned before.
22. Has stimulated me to think about old problems in new ways.

**Perceived Control** (Modified from Schat & Kelloway, 2000)
Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong> ($a = .85$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I understand why my leader behaves as he or she does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I know why interactions with my leader occur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know why my leader treats me as he or she does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I understand why my leader sometimes reacts negatively to me at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prediction</strong> ($a = .93$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am able to predict the behavior of my leader at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am able to predict my interactions with my leader.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to predict how my leader will react in certain situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to predict if and when my leader might become upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I can predict how my leader will treat me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Influence ($a = .89$)
1. I am able to prevent negative interactions with my leader from happening.
2. I am able to deal with challenging situations that occur with my leader at work.
3. I am able to respond to negative situations with my leader at work.
4. I am able to influence my relationship with my leader.

Structural Ambivalence Adapted from Crites, Fabrigar and Petty (1994)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which the following words apply to your leader:

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale Items:

My leader is:

Global evaluation (positive)
1. Good
2. Likeable
3. Positive
4. Satisfactory

Global evaluation (negative)
1. Bad
2. Dislikeable
3. Negative
4. Unsatisfactory

Warm (Affective Dimension)
1. Friendly
2. Warm
3. Good natured
4. Sincere
5. Understanding

Cold (Affective Dimension)
1. Unfriendly
2. Cold
3. Irritable
4. Insincere
5. Moody

*Competence (Cognitive Dimension)*
1. Competent
2. Capable
3. Efficient
4. Intelligent
5. Knowledgeable

*Incompetence (Cognitive Dimension)*
1. Incompetent
2. Inept
3. Inefficient
4. Foolish
5. Naïve

**Subjective ambivalence** Modified from Priester and Petty (1996).

Scale Items and Response Scales:

1. How conflicted do you feel toward your leader?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel no conflict at all</th>
<th>Feel maximum conflict</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much indecisiveness do you feel toward your leader?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel no indecision at all</th>
<th>Feel maximum indecision</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you have mixed reactions toward your leader?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely one-sided reactions</th>
<th>Completely mixed reactions</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trust (McAllister, 1995)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about your leader

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

**Affect-based trust**
1. We have a sharing relationship. We can both freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes.
2. I can talk freely to this individual about difficulties I am having at work and know that they will want to listen.
3. We would both feel a sense of loss if one of us was transferred and we could no longer work together.
4. If I shared my problems with this person, I know they would respond constructively and caringly.
5. I would have to say that we have both made considerable emotional investments in our working relationship.

**Cognition-based trust**
1. This person approaches their job with professionalism and dedication.
2. Given this person's track record, I see no reason to doubt their competence and preparation for the job.
3. I can rely on this person not to make my job more difficult by careless work.
4. Most people, even those who aren't close friends of this individual, trust and respect them as a coworker.
5. Other work associates of mine who must interact with this individual consider them to be trustworthy.
6. If people knew more about this individual and their background, they would be more concerned and monitor their performance more closely (Reverse coded).

**Role Ambiguity** House, Schuler & Levanoni (1983)

Response Scale:
Scale Items:

1. I have clear planned goals and objectives for my job
2. I know exactly what is expected of me
3. My boss makes it clear how they will evaluate my performance
4. I know what my responsibilities are

**Psychological Strain** (GHQ-12, Goldberg, 1972)

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>No more than usual</th>
<th>Rather more than usual</th>
<th>Much more than usual</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

Have you recently:
1. been able to concentrate on whatever you’re doing? (RC)
2. felt capable of making decisions about things? (RC)
3. been able to face up to your problems? (RC)
4. lost much sleep over worry?
5. felt constantly under strain?
6. felt you could not overcome your difficulties?
7. been feeling unhappy and depressed?
8. been losing confidence in yourself?
9. been thinking of yourself as worthless person?
10. felt that you are playing a useful part in things?
11. been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities? (RC)
12. been feeling reasonably happy all things considered? (RC)

**Avoidance of Leader** Côté, Moskowitz, and Zuroff (2011)

Participant Instructions: Please rate the degree to which you engaged in this behavior with your leader over the past month.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale Items:

1. I avoided him/her
2. I ignored him/her
3. I did not make an effort to include him/her in a conversation

**Replacing the Leader** (Modified from De Cremer, 2003)

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Very much so</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale Items:

1. Please indicate how much you would like to replace your leader with another leader.
2. To what extent would you like to replace your leader?

**Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale** (Rosenberg, 1965)

Participant Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please select the response that reflects your agreement

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

1. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times, I think I am no good at all (reverse scored)
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (reverse scored)
6. I certainly feel useless at times. (reverse scored)
7. I feel that I’m a person of worth.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. (reverse scored)
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (reverse scored)
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

**The Mini-IPIP** (Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006)
Participant Instructions: Below are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very inaccurate</th>
<th>Moderately inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither inaccurate nor accurate</th>
<th>Moderately Accurate</th>
<th>Very accurate</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I am the life of the party.
2. I sympathize with others’ feelings.
3. I get chores done right away.
4. I have frequent mood swings.
5. I have a vivid imagination.
6. I don’t talk a lot. (R)
7. I am not interested in other people’s problems. (R)
8. I often forget to put things back in their proper place. (R)
9. I am relaxed most of the time. (R)
10. I am not interested in abstract ideas. (R)
11. I talk to a lot of different people at parties.
12. I feel others’ emotions.
13. I like order.
15. I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas. (R)
16. I keep in the background. (R)
17. I am not really interested in others. (R)
18. I make a mess of things. (R)
19. I seldom feel blue. (R)
20. I do not have a good imagination. (R)
Appendix D: Study 3 Vignettes

Vignette Instructions:

As you may know, annual performance evaluations are common in organizations across Canada. These evaluations are frequently completed by supervisors without input from other individuals who work closely with the employee such as peers or direct reports. Organizations that wish to capture input from employee’s peers and direct reports in addition to their supervisors, often use what are referred to as 360-degree evaluations. As you can imagine, 360-degree evaluations tend to be more informative than traditional performance evaluations. To that end, Queen’s University uses 360-degree feedback when making promotion decisions.

Recently, Queen’s University has decided to allow student volunteers to sit on promotion evaluation committees as neutral evaluators. Students who volunteer to gain experience are provided with an employee’s 360-degree feedback and asked to translate the information provided into numerical ratings of the candidate. Your role as a neutral evaluator is very important! The individuals you will be rating are already leaders in the University Administration, but they may be appointed to even more important leadership roles within the University based in part on your input. Therefore, we ask you to pay close attention to the information provided and make thoughtful decisions when providing numerical ratings. In this task you will read a real 360-degree feedback report that was prepared for a leader at Queen’s. After learning about this leader, you will be asked to answer questions based on your impression of this individual. Finally, after providing these ratings, you will be asked to answer some questions about yourself.

This task will begin on the next screen where you will be provided with the 360-degree evaluation feedback.
Christopher/Christine Smith

Results generated by: Surveypro.com

*High Warmth/High Competence

---

### JOB PERFORMANCE

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
- exceeds performance standards  
- completes tasks on schedule

**PEER COMMENTS**
- has a great deal of job knowledge  
- efficient in his (her) work role

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
- has a lot of creative ideas  
- foresees potential problems before they occur

---

### INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
- compassionate  
- sincere in his (her) dealings

**PEER COMMENTS**
- a good listener  
- tolerant of people’s differences

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
- warm in his (her) interactions  
- very helpful
**360 DEGREE FEEDBACK RESULTS**

Christopher/Christine Smith

Results generated by: Surveypros.com

*Low Warmth/Low Competence

**JOB PERFORMANCE**

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
- falls short of expected performance standards
- frequently requires deadline extensions

**PEER COMMENTS**
- limited job knowledge
- a little passive in his (her) work role

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
- doesn’t have a lot of creative ideas
- doesn’t foresee potential problems until they occur

**INTERPERSONAL SKILLS**

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
- lacks compassion
- sometimes seems insincere in his (her) dealings

**PEER COMMENTS**
- does not listen to others
- intolerant of people’s differences

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
- can be quite cold in his (her) interactions
- sometimes unhelpful
# 360 Degree Feedback Results

Christopher/Christine Smith

Results generated by: Surveypros.com

*High Competence/Low Warmth (Between Dimension)*

## JOB PERFORMANCE

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
- exceeds performance standards
- completes tasks on schedule

**PEER COMMENTS**
- has a great deal of job knowledge
- efficient in his (her) work role

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
- has a lot of creative ideas
- foresees potential problems before they occur

## INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
- lacks compassion
- sometimes seems insincere in his (her) dealings

**PEER COMMENTS**
- does not listen to others
- intolerant of people’s differences

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
- can be quite cold in his (her) interactions
- sometimes unhelpful
360 DEGREE FEEDBACK RESULTS

Christopher/Christine Smith

Results generated by: Surveypros.com

*High Warmth/Low Competence (Between Dimension)

---

**JOB PERFORMANCE**

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
· falls short of expected performance standards
· frequently requires deadline extensions

**PEER COMMENTS**
· limited job knowledge
· a little passive in his (her) work role

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
· doesn’t have a lot of creative ideas
· doesn’t foresee potential problems until they occur

---

**INTERPERSONAL SKILLS**

**SUPERVISOR COMMENTS**
· compassionate
· sincere in his (her) dealings

**PEER COMMENTS**
· a good listener
· tolerant of people’s differences

**DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS**
· warm in his (her) interactions
· very helpful
Christopher/Christine Smith

360 DEGREE FEEDBACK RESULTS

Results generated by: Surveypros.com

*Within Dimension

JOB PERFORMANCE

SUPERVISOR COMMENTS
· exceeds performance standards
· completes tasks on schedule

PEER COMMENTS
· has a great deal of job knowledge
· a little passive in his (her) work role

DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS
· doesn’t have a lot of creative ideas
· doesn’t foresee potential problems until they occur

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS

SUPERVISOR COMMENTS
· compassionate
· a bit contrived in his (her) dealings

PEER COMMENTS
· a good listener
· tolerant of people’s differences

DIRECT REPORT COMMENTS
· can be quite cold in some of his (her) interactions
· sometimes unhelpful
Appendix E: Study 3 Measures

Completed during Pre-screening:

**Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale** (Rosenberg, 1965)

Participant Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please select the response that reflects your agreement

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

1. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times, I think I am no good at all (reverse scored)
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. (reverse scored)
6. I certainly feel useless at times. (reverse scored)
7. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. (reverse scored)
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. (reverse scored)
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

**Implicit Leadership Theories** (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Offermann et al., 1994)

Participant Instructions: How characteristic is each of the following traits of a business leader?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all characteristic</th>
<th>Extremely characteristic</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding
Sincere
Helpful
Intelligent
Clever
Knowledgeable
Educated
Motivated
Dedicated
Hard-working
Dynamic
Strong
Energetic
Domineering
Pushy
Manipulative
Loud
Conceited
Selfish
Male
Masculine

Promotion Recommendation

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.
Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale Items:
1. Christopher(Christine) Smith is ready for promotion
2. I recommend Christopher(Christine) Smith for promotion

Structural Ambivalence Adapted from Crites, Fabrigar and Petty (1994)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which the following words apply to Christopher(Christine) Smith:

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale Items:

Global evaluation (positive)
1. Good
2. Like
3. Positive
Global evaluation (negative)
1. Bad
2. Dislike
3. Negative

Warm (Affective Dimension)
1. Friendly
2. Warm
3. Good natured
4. Sincere
5. Understanding

Cold (Affective Dimension)
1. Unfriendly
2. Cold
3. Irritable
4. Insincere
5. Moody

Competence (Cognitive Dimension)
1. Competent
2. Capable
3. Efficient
4. Intelligent
5. Knowledgeable

Incompetence (Cognitive Dimension)
1. Incompetent
2. Inept
3. Inefficient
4. Foolish
5. Naïve


Scale Items and Response Scales:

1. How conflicted do you feel toward Christopher(Christine) Smith?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel no conflict at all</th>
<th>Feel maximum conflict</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How much indecisiveness do you feel toward Christopher(Christine) Smith?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feel no indecision at all</th>
<th>Feel maximum indecision</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Do you have mixed reactions toward Christopher(Christine) Smith?

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely one-sided reactions</th>
<th>Completely mixed reactions</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant Instructions: For the following section, please imagine that you work for Christopher(Christine) Smith and answer the following questions.

**Perceived Control** (Modified from Schat & Kelloway, 2000)

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale Items:

**Understanding**
1. I understand why Christopher(Christine) Smith behaves as they do
2. I know why interactions with Christopher(Christine) Smith occur

**Prediction**
1. I am able to predict the behavior of Christopher(Christine) Smith.
2. I am able to predict how Christopher(Christine) Smith will treat me.

**Influence**
1. I could prevent negative interactions with Christopher(Christine) Smith from happening.
2. I could deal with challenging situations that occur with Christopher(Christine) Smith at work.
Trust McAllister’s (1995) scale modified to the laboratory environment.

Participant Instructions: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale Items:

Affect-based trust
1. I could talk freely to Christopher(Christine) Smith about difficulties I was having at work and know that they would want to listen
2. If I shared my problems with Christopher(Christine) Smith, I know they would respond constructively and caringly.

Cognition-based trust
1. Christopher(Christine) Smith approaches their job with professionalism and dedication
2. I could rely on Christopher(Christine) Smith not to make my job more difficult by careless work.

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS, Watson et al., 1988)

Participant Instructions: This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment. Use the following scale to record your answers.

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Scale Items:
interested
distressed
excited
upset
strong
guilty
scared
hostile
enthusiastic
proud
irritable
alert
ashamed
inspired
nervous
determined
attentive
jittery
active
afraid
Manipulation Checks

Participant Instructions: Based on the 360-degree evaluation feedback, please rate:

Response Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The leader in the scenario’s interpersonal skills
2. The leader in the scenario’s job performance
3. What gender was the individual in the 360-degree evaluation feedback?

Male

Female
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